A DEFENCE Of Mr. JOHN COTTON From the imputation of SELFE CONTRADICTION, charged on him by Mr. DAN: CAVVDREY

Written by himselfe not long before his death.

Whereunto is prefixed, an Answer to a late Treatise of the said Mr. CAVVDREY about the nature of SCHISME.

By JOHN OWEN: D:D:

Δεῖ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίληπτον εἶναι, ὡς Θεοῦ οἰκονόμον, μὴ αὐθάδη, μὴ ὀργίλον, μὴ πάροινον, μὴ πλήκτην, μὴ αἰσχροκερδῆ, Tit. 1. 7.

OXFORD,

Printed by H: HALL; for T. ROBINSON. 1658.

BIBLIOTHECA BODLEIANA

CHRISTIAN READER,

I have not much to say unto thee, concerning the insuing Treatise; it will *speake* for it selfe with all impartiall men, much lesse shall I insist on the commendation of it's *Author*, who also being dead *yet speaketh*; and will *be so* I am perswaded, whilest Christ hath a Church upon the Earth; The Treatise it selfe was written sundry yeeres agoe, immediately upon the publishing of Mr *Cawdryes Accusation* against him; I shall not need to give an account whence it hath been, that it saw the light no sooner; it may suffice, that in mine own behalfe and of others, I doe acknowledge that in the doing of sundry things seeming of more *importance*, this

ought not to have been *omitted*, The judgment of the *Author* approving of this vindication of himselfe as necessary, considering *the place* he held in the Church of God, should have been a rule unto us, for the performance of that duty, which is owing to his worth and piety, in doing and suffering for the Truth of God. It is now about 7 *months* agoe, since it came into my hands, and since I ingaged my selfe into the *publication* of it, my not immediate proceeding therein, being *sharply* rebuked by a fresh charge upon my selfe from that hand, under which this *worthy Person* so farre suffered, as to be necessitated to the ensuing defensative, I have here discharged that ingagement. The Author of the charge against him, in his Epistle *to that* against me, tells his Reader, that *it is thought that it was intended by another* (*and now promised by my selfe*) *to be published to cast a Slurre upon him*; so are our *intentions* judged, so our *wayes*, by *thoughts* and *reports*. Why a *Vindication* of Mr *Cotton* should

cast a *slurre* upon Mr *Cawdry* I know not; Is he concern'd in *Spirit* or *Reputation* in the Acquitment of an *holy*, *reverend Person* now at rest with Christ; from imputations of *inconstancie* and selfe *contradiction*? Is there not roome enough in the world, to beare the *good names* of Mr *Cotton* and Mr *Cawdry*? but that if one be *vindicated* the other must be *slurred*? He shall find now by experience, what assistance he found from him who loved him, to beare his charge, and to repell it, without any such *reflection* on his *Accuser*, as might favour of an intention to *slurre* him; *mala mens*, *malus animus*; the measure that men feare from others, they have commonly *meted* out unto them before hand; He wishes those *that intend to rake in the ashes of the dead, to consider whether they shall deserve any thanks for their labour*. How the covering of *the dead* with their own *comely garments*, comes to be a *raking into their ashes*, I know not; His name is alive, though he be dead; It was that, not his person, that was attempted

tempted to be wounded, by the charge against him; to powre forth that *balme* for it's *healing*, now he is dead, which himselfe *provided* whilest he was alive, without adding or diminishing one syllable, is no *rakeing into his ashes*; and I hope the δευτεραι φροντιδες of the Reverend Authour, will not allow him to be offended, that this friendly office is performed to a dead *Brother*; to publish this his defence of his own innocency, written in obedience to a prime dictate of the law of Nature, against the wrong which was not done him in secret.

But the intendment of this prefatory *discourse*, being my own *concernment*, in reference to a *late tract of* Mr *Cawdries*, bearing in it's Title and Superscription, a vindication from *my unjust clamours and false aspersions*; I shall not detaine the Reader with any farther discourse of that, which he will find fully debated in the insuing Treatise it selfe; but immediately addresse my selfe to that, which is my present peculiar designe; By what wayes and meanes the difference

difference betwixt us is come to that issue wherein now it stands stated, in the expressions before mentioned, I shall not need to repeat. Who first let out *those waters of strife*, who hath filled their streames with *bitternesse*, *clamour & false aspersions*, is left to the judgment of all, that feare the Lord, who shall have occasion at any time to reflect upon those discourses, How ever it is come to passe, I must acknowledge that the state of the Controversy betweene us is now *degenerated* into such an useleſſe strife of words, as that I dare publickly owne engagemẽts into *studies* of so much more importance unto the interest of truth, Piety, and literature, as that I cannot with *peace* in my own retirements, be much further conversant therein. Only whereas I am not in the least convinced, that Mr *Cawdry* hath given *satisfaction* to my former Expostulations, about the injuries done me in his other Treatise, and hath evidently added to the *number* and weight of them in this, I could not but lay hold of this opportunity given, by my

charging a former promiſe, once more to remind him of ſome miſcarriages, exceedingly unbecomeing his profeſſion and calling; which I ſhall doe in a briefe review of his Epiſtle and Treatiſe. Upon the conſideration whereof, without charging him or his way with *ſchiſme*, in great letters on the *Title-page* of this book, I doubt not but it will appear, that the guilt of the crime he *falſly*, *unjuſtly*, & *uncharitably* chargeth upon others, may be laid more equitably at his own door; and that the *ſhortneſſe* of the *covering* to hide themſelves, uſed by him and others from the inquiſition made after them for *ſchiſme*, upon their own principles, will not be ſupplyed by ſuch outcryes as thoſe he is pleaſed to uſe after them, who are leaſt of all men concerned in the matter under conteſt, there being no ſolid *medium*, whereby they may be impleaded. And in this diſcourſe, I ſhall, as I ſuppoſe, put an end to my engagement in this *controverſy*; I know no man whoſe patience will inable him to abide alwayes in the conſideration of things

things to so little purpose; were it not that men beare themselves on high by resting on the *partiall* adherence of many to their *dictates*, it were impossible they should reape any contentment in their retirements from such a management of Controversies as this; *Independency* is a great schisme, it hath made all the *divisions* amongst us, *Brownists*, *Anabaptists*, and all sectaries are Independents; they deny our *Ministers* and Churches, they *seperate* from us, all errors come from among them, this I have *been told*, and that I have heard, is the summe of this Treatise; *who* they are of whom he speakes, how they came into such a *possession* of all Church state in *England*, that all that are not with *them* are *Schismatickes*; how *de jure*, or *de facto*, they came to be so instated; what claime they can make to their present stations, without *schisme*, on their own principles; whether granting the *Church of England* as constituted when they and we begun that, which we call Reformation, to

have

have been a True instituted Church they have any *Power* of rule in it, but what hath been got by *violence*, what, that is purely theirs, hath any pretence of establishment, from the scripture, antiquity, and the lawes of this land? I say with these and the like things, which are incumbent on him to cleare up, before his Charges with us will be of any value, our *Author* troubleth not himselfe. But to proceed to the particulars by him insisted on.

1. He tels the *Reader* in his *Epistle*, that his unwillingnesse to this *rejoinder* was heightned by the Necessity he found, of *discovering some personall weaknesses and forgetfulnesses in me, upon my denyall of some things which were known to be true, if he should proceed therin*; for what he intimates of the *unpleasantnesse* that it is to him, to discover things of that *importance* in me, when he professeth his designe to be to *impaire* my *Authority*, so far that the cause I own may receive no countenance thereby; I leave it to him, who will one day reveale *the secrets* of all hearts,

hearts, which at present are open and naked unto him; but how I pray are the *things* by me denyed *known* to be true? seeing it was *unpleasant* and *distastfull* to him to insist upon them, men might expect that his *Evidence* of them, was not only *open*, cleare, *undenyable*, and manifest as to it's *truth*, but *cogent* as to their publication; The whole insisted on is, *if there be any truth in reports; hic nigræ succus loliginis, hæc est aruga mera;* Is this a *bottome* for a *Minister* of the Gospel to proceed upon, to such charges as those insinuated; is not *the course of Nature* set on fire at this day, *by reports?* is any thing more contrary to the *royall law of charity*, than to take up reports as the ground of charges and accusations? Is there any thing more *unbecoming* a man, laying aside all considerations of christianity, than to suffer his *judgment* to be tainted, much more his words, and publick expressions in charging, & accusing others to be regulated by reports? and whereas we are commanded to speak *evill of no man*, may we not on this ground,

ground, *speak evill of all men*; and justify our selves by saying it is so, *if reports be true?* the Prophet tel's us, that a *combination* for his *defaming* and *reproach* was managed among his Adversaries, *Jer.* 20.10. *I have heard the defaming of many, feare on every side, report say they, and we will report it*; if they can have any to goe before them in the *Transgression* of that Law, which he who knowes how the *tongues of men* are set on fire of Hell, gave out to lay a restraint upon them, *thou shalt not raise a false report*, Exod. 23.1. They will second it, and spread it abroad to the utmost, for his disadvantage and trouble; Whether this procedure of our Reverend Authour, come not up to the *practice* of their designe, I leave to his own conscience to judge. Should men suffer their *Spirits* to be heightned by provocations of this nature, unto a recharge from the same *offensive dunghill of reports*, what monsters should we speedily be transformed unto? but this being far frō being the only place wherein appeale

is

is made to *reports* and *hearesayes* by our *Authour*, I shall have occasion in the consideration of the severals of them, to reassume this discourse. For what he addes about the space of *time* wherein my former reply was drawn up, because I know not whether he had *heard any report* insinuated to the contrary to what I affirmed, I shall not trouble him with giving evidence thereunto: but only adde that here he hath the *product* of halfe that time, which I now *interpose* upon the review of my *transcribed* papers: Only whereas it is said that Mr *Cawdry* is an *antient* man; I cannot but wonder he should be so easy of beliefe; *Arist. Rhetor. lib.* 2. *c.* 18. tel's us, οἱ πρεσβύτεροι, ἄπιστοι, δι' ἀμπειρίαν, and not apt to believe; whence on all *occasions* of discourse προστιθέασιν ἀεὶ τὸ ἴσως καὶ τάχα; but he believes all that comes to hand with an *easy Faith*, which he hath totally in his own power, to dispose of at pleasure. That I was in *passion* when I wrote my review is his judgment; but this is but *man's day*; we are in expectation of

that;

that, wherein the *world shall be judged in righteousnesse*; it is to possible that my spirit was not in that frame in all things, wherein it ought to have been; but that the Reverend Authour knowes not; I have nothing to say to this, but that of the *Philosopher*—Ἐὰν τὸν Σοι ἀπαγγείλῃ ὅτι ὁ δεῖνα σε κακῶς λέγει, μὴ ἀπολογῇ πρὸς τὰ λεχθέντα, ἀλλ' ἀποκρίνου ὅτι ἀγνοῦν, τὰ ἄλλα προσόντα μοι κακὰ ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἂν ταῦτα μόνα ἔλεγεν, *Epic. Cap.* 48. *Much* I confesse, was *not spoken by me* (which he afterwards insisteth on) *to the Argumentative part of his booke*, which as in *an answer* I was not to *looke* for, so to *find*, had been a difficult taske. As he hath nothing to say, unto the *differences* among themselves both in *judgment* and *practice*, soe how little there is, in his recrimination of the differences among us, as *that one and the same man differeth from himselfe*, which charge he casts upon Mr *Cotton and myselfe*, will speedily be manifested to all impartiall men. For the *Treatise* it selfe whose consideration I now proceed unto, that I may reduce what I have to say unto it, unto the bounds intended

in

in confining my *defensative* unto this Preface to the treatise of another, I shall referre it unto certaine Heads, that will be comprehensive of the *whole*, and give the Reader a cleare and distinct view thereof.

I shall begin with that which is least handled in the two bookes of this *Reverend Author*, though the summe of what was pleaded by me in my *Treatise of Schisme*. For the *discovery* of the true nature of Schisme, and the vindication of them who were falsly charged with the *crime* thereof, I layd downe two *Principles* as the foundation of all that I Asserted in the whole cause insisted on; which may briefly be reduced to these two *Syllogismes*.

1. If in all and every place of the new Testament where there is mention made of *Schisme*, name, or thing, in an *Ecclesiasticall* sence; there is nothing intended by it, but a *divisiõ* in a particular Church; then that is the proper Scripture notion of Schisme in the Ecclesiasticall sence; but in all and every place &c: *ergo*, the

The *Proposition* being cleare and evident in it's own light, the *Assumption* was confirmed in my Treatise, by an induction of the severall *instances* that might any way seeme to belong unto it.

My second principle was raised upon a *concession of the generall nature of Schisme* restrained with one necessary limitation and amounts unto this Argument.

It *Schisme in an Ecclesiasticall sense*, be the breach of *an Union* of Christ's institution, then they who are not guilty of *the breach of any union* of Christ's Institution, are not guilty of Schisme; but so is Schisme, *Ergò*,

The *Proposition* also of this *Syllogisme* with it's inference being *unquestionable*, for the confirmation of the *Assumption* I considered the nature of all *Church Union* as instituted by Christ, and pleaded the innocency of those whose defence in several degrees I had undertaken, by their freedome from the breach of any Church Union. Not finding the Reverend *Authour* in his first *answer* to speake *clearely* and

and distinctly to either of those principles, but to proceed in a course of *perpetual diversion*, from the thing in question, with reflections, charges &c: All rather I hope out of an *unacquaintednesse with the true nature of argumentation*, than any perverseneſſe of ſpirit, in cavilling at what he found he could not anſwer; I earneſtly deſired him in my *review* that we might have a faire and *friendly meeting*, perſonally to debate theſe principles which he had undertaken to oppoſe, and ſo to prevent trouble to our ſelves and others, in writing and reading things remote from the *merit* of the cauſe undergitation; what returnes I have had hereto, the Reader is now acquainted withall, from his *rejoinder*, the particulars whereof ſhall be farther enquired into afterward.

The other parts of his two bookes conſiſt in his charges upon me, about my Judgment in ſundry particulars, not relating, in the leaſt that I can as yet underſtand, unto the *Controverſy* in hand; As to his excurſions, about *Browniſts*,

Anabaptists Seekers, rending the peace of their Churches, seperating from them, the errours of *the Seperatists*, and the like, I cannot apprehend my selfe concerned to take notice of them; to the *other things* an Answer shall be returned, and a defence made, so farre as I can judge it necessary. It may be our Author seekes a Releife from the *Charge of Schisme* that lyes upon him and his party (as they are called) from others, by mannaging the same charge against them, who he thinkes will not returne it upon them: but for my part, I shall assure him that were he not in my judgment more acacquitted upon my principles than upon his owne, I should be necessitated to stand upon even termes with him herein; but to have advantages from want of charity, as the *Donatists* had against the *Catholickes*, is no Argument of a Good cause.

In the *first Chapter* there occurs not any thing of *reall* difference as to the cause under agitation, that should require *a review*, being spent wholy in things

things ἔξω τοῦ πράγματος. And therefore I shall briefly *animadvert* on what seemes of most concernment therein, in the *manner* of his procedure. His former discourse, and this also consisting much of *my words* perverted by adding in the close something that might wrest them to his owne purpose, he tels me in the beginning of his third Chapter, that this is *to turne my testimony against my selfe, which is*, as he saith, *and allowed way of the clearest victory*, which it seemes he aimeth at; but nothing can be more remote from being defended with that pretence than this his way of proceeding. 'Tis not of *urging a Testimony* from me, against me, that I complained, but the perverting of my words, by either *heading*, or *closeing* of them with his owne, quite to other purposes than those of their owne intendment: a *way* whereby any man may make other *mens words* to speake what he pleaseth; as Mr *Riddle* hy his leading *questions*, and *knitting* of Scriptures to his expressions in them, makes an appearance of con-

straining the *word of God* to speake out all his *Socinian blasphemies*.

In this course he still continues; and his very entrance gives us a *pledge* of what we are to expect in the processe of his management of the present businesse; whereas I had said, that *considering the various interests of parties at differente, there is no great successe to be promised by the management of Controversies, though with never so much evidence and conviction of truth*; to the repetition of my words he subjoines the instance of *Sectaries, not restrained by the cleerest demonstration of truth*; not weighing how facile a taske it is, to supply *Presbyterians* in their room; which in his account is, it seemes, to *turne his testimony against himselfe*, & as he somewhere *phraseth it, to turne the point of his sword into his owne bowels*; but, *nobis non licet esse tam disertis*; neither do we here, either *learne* or *teach* any such way of disputation.

His following leaves are spent for the most part in *slighting* the Notion of

Schisme

Schisme by me insisted on, and in reporting my arguments for it *(p.8, 9, 12.)* in such a *way* and manner, as argues that he either never understood them, or is willing to pervert them. The true nature and importance of them I have before laid downe, and shall not now againe repeat: Though I shall adde that his frequent repetition of his disproving *that principle*, which it appeares, that he never yet contended with all, in its *Full strength*, brings but little advantage to his cause, with persons whose interest doth not compell them to take up things on trust. How well he cleares himselfe from the *charge of reviling* and useing *opprobrious* reproachful termes, although he professe himselfe to have been *astonished* at the *charge*, may be seen in his justification of himselfe therein. *pag.* 16, 17, 18, 19. with his reinforceing every particular expression instanced in; and yet he tels me, for inferring that he discovered *sanguinary thoughts* in reference unto them whose removall from their *native soyle* into the wildernesse, he

affirmes, England's happinesse would have consisted in, that *he hath much adoe to forbeare once more to say the Lord rebuke thee:* for my part, I have received such a *satisfactory taste* of his spirit and way, that as I shall not from *henceforth* desire him to keep in any thing, that he can *hardly forbeare* to let out, but rather to use his utmost liberty; so I must assure him that I am very little *concerned*, or not at all, in what he shall be *pleased* to *say*, or to forbeare for the time to come; himselfe hath freed me of that concernment.

The first particular of value insisted on, is his *charge upon me* for the deniall of all the *Churches of England to be true Churches of Christ, except the Churches gathered, in a Congregationall way:* Having frequently and without hesitation charged this opinion upon me in his first answer, knowing it to be very false, I expostulated with him about it in my *Review*. Insteed of accepting the *satisfaction* tendered in my expresse deniall of any such thought or perswasion, or tendering any satisfaction as to the wrong

done me, he seekes to justify himselfe in his charge, and so persisteth therein. The Reasons he gives of his so doing are not unworthy a little to be *remarked.*

The first is this; *He supposed me to be an Independent*, and therefore made that charge; the consequent of which supposition is much to weake, to justify this Reverend Authour in his Accusation; doth he suppose that he may without offence, lay what he please to the charge of an *Independent?* but he saith secondly, that he tooke the word *Independent, generally, as comprehending Brownists, & Anabaptists, and other Sectaries*: But herein also he doth but delude his owne conscience, seeing he *personally* speakes to me and to my designe in that booke of Schisme, which he undertook to confute; which also removes his third intimation, that he formerly intended *any kind of Independency*, &c. the rest that follow are of the same nature, and however compounded will not make a salve to heale the wound made in his reputation by his own weapon; for the learned

learned Author, *called vox populi*, which he is pleased here to urge? I first question whither he be *willing* to be produced to maintaine this *Charge*; and if he shall appeare, I must needs tell him, (what he here questions whether it be so, or no) that he is a *very lyar*. For any *principles* in my Treatise, whence a denyall of their *Ministers and Churches* may be regularly deduced, let him produce them if he can; and if not, acknowledge that there had been a more Christian and ingenious way of coming off an ingagement into that charge, then that by him chosen to be insisted on; *animos & iram ex crimine sumunt*. And againe we have *vox populi* cited on the like occasion, *pag.* 34; about my refusall to answer whither I were a Minister or not; which as the thing it selfe of such a refusal of mine on any occasion in the world, (because it must be spoken) is *purum putum mendacium*, so it is no truer, that, that was *vox populi* at Oxford which is pretended; that which is *vox populi*, must be publicke: *publicum* was once

populi-

populicum, now setting aside the *whisperers*, of it may be two or three *Ardelio's*, notorious *triflers*, whose lavish impertinency, will deliver any man from the danger of being slandered by their tongues, and there will be little gound left for the report, that is *fathered* on *vox populi*: And I tell him here once againe (which is a sufficient answer indeed to his whole first Chapter) that I doe not deny *Presbyterian Churches* to be true Churches of Jesus Christ, not the ministers of them to be true ministers, nor doe maintaine a *nullity* in their *Ordination* as to what is the proper use and end of *Ordination*, (taking it in the sense, wherin by them it is taken,) though I think it neither administred by them in *due order*, nor to have in it selfe that force and efficacy, singly considered, which by many of them is ascribed unto it. Thus much of my judgment I have publiquely declared long agoe, and I thought I might have expected from persons *Professing Christianity*, that

Vid Gerard. loc. Com. de Ministr. Eccleſiaſt. Sect. 11. 12.

that they would not voluntarilyengage themselves into an opposition against me, and waveing my judgment which I had constantly published and preached, have gathered up *reports* from *private* and *table* discourses, most of them false and untrue, all of them uncertaine, the occasions and coherences of those discourses from whence they have been raised and taken, being utterly *lost*, or at present by him wholly omitted. His following excursions about a *successive ordination from Rome*, wherein he runnes crosse to the most *eminent lights* of all the Reformed Churches, and their declared Judgments, with practise in reordaining those who come unto them with that *Romane stampe* upon them, I shall not further interest my selfe in, nor think my selfe concerned so to doe, untill I see a satisfactory answer given unto *Beza* and others in this very point; and yet I must here againe professe, that I cannot understand that distinction of deriveing ordination from the *Church of Rome*, but not from the *Roman Church*. Let him but seriously peruse these ensu-

ing words of *Beza*, and tell me whither he have any ground of a particular quarrell against me upon this account.

Sed præterea quænam ista est quæso ordinaria vocatio, quam eos habuisse dicis, quos Deus paucis quibusdam exceptis, excitavit? Certe papistica. Nam hæc tua verba sunt, Hodie si episcopi Gallicanarum ecclesiarum se & suas ecclesias à tyrannide Episcopi Romani vindicare velint, & eas ab omni idololatria & superstitione repurgare, non habent opus alia vocatione ab ea quam habent. Quid ergo? Papisticas ordinationes, in quibus neque morum examen præcessit, neque leges ullæ servatæ sunt inviolabiliter ex divino jure in electionibus & ordinationibus præscriptæ, in quibus puri etiam omnes canones impudentissime violati sunt: quæ nihil aliud sunt, quam fœdissima Romani prostibulin undinatio, quavis meretricum mercede, quam Deus templo suo inferri prohibuit, inquinatior: quibus denique alii non ad prædicandum sed pervertendum evangelium: alii non ad docendum, sed ad rursus sacrificandum, & ad abominandum Σολολυγμα

sunt ordinati, usque adeo firmas tecum esse censebimus, ut quoties tali cuipiam pseudoepiscopo, Deus concesserit ad verum Christianismum transire omnis illa istiusmodi ordinationis impuritas simul expurgata censeatur? Imo quia sic animum per Dei gratiam mutavit, quo ore, quo pudore, qua conscientia papismum quidem detestabitur, suam autem inordinatissimam ordinationem non ejurabit? aut si, ejuret, quomodo ex illius jure auctoritatem dicendi habebit. Nec tamen nego quin tales, si probe doctrinam veram tenere, si honestis moribus præditi, si ad gregem pascendum apti comperiantur, ex pseudoepiscopis novi pastores, legitime designentur; Thus he, who was thought then to speake the sense of the Churches of *Geneva* and *France*; in his book against *Saravia* about the diverse orders of *Ministers in the Church*.

His *plea* for the *Church-Authority* of the *Pope*, notwithstanding his being an *Idolater*, *a murderer*, *the man of sinne* an adversary of Christ, because a Civill magistrate doth not by any *morall Crime*

or

or those where of the *Pope is guilty*, loose his jurisdiction and Authority, considering the different principles, grounds, ends, laws, Rules, priviledges of the Authority of the one, and the other, and the severall *tenures*, whereby the one doth hold, and the other pretends to hold his power, is brought in to serve the turne in hand, and may be easily layd aside?

And when he shall manifest, that there is appointed by Christ, one *single High-Preist* or Prelate in the house of God the whole Church; and *that office* to be confined to one *nation*, one blood, *one family*, propagated by naturall generation, without any provision of relieve by any other way, person or family in case of miscarriage; and when he shall have *proved* that such an *officer* as the *Pope of Rome*, in any one particular that constituteth him such an officer, was once *instituted* by Christ, I shall farther attend unto his *Reason* for his Authority from that of the *High-Priests* among the Jewes, which was not lost as to it's

conti-

continuance in the family of *Aaron* notwithstanding the miscarriage of some individuall Person vested therewithall; In the close of the Chapter he reassumes his charge of my *renouncing my owne Ordination* which with great confidence, and without the least *scruple*, he had asserted in his *Answer*; of that assertion he now pretends to give the Reasons, whereof the first is this.

1. *The world lookes on him as an Independent of the highest note*; therefore he hath renounced his ordination; and therefore *I dare to say so*. So much for that reason. I understand neither the *Logick* nor *morality* of this first Reason.

2. *He knowes from good hands that some of the Brethren have renounced their Ordination*, therefore he durst say positively *that I have renounced mine*. Prov. 12.18.

3. He hath heard that I disswaded others from *their ordination*, and therefore he durst say I renownced my owne; and yet I suppose he may possibly dis-

swade.

swade some from *Episcopall Ordination*: but I know it not; no more than he knowes what he affirmes of me which is false.

4. He concludes *from the principles in my book of Schisme*, because I said that to insist upon a *succession of ordination from Anti-Christ and the Beast of Rome would if I mistake not keep up in this particular what God would have pulled down*, therefore I renounced my ordination; when he knowes that I avowed the validity of ordination on another account.

5. If all this will not doe, he tels me of something that was said at a *publique meeting* (*at dinner* it seemes) with the *Canons of* Chhist-Church, *viz:* that *I vallued not my ordination by the Bishop of Oxford any more than a crum upon my trencher*, which words whether ever they were spoken or no, or to what purpose, or in reference to what Ordination, (I meane of the two orders) or in what sense, or with what limitation, or as part of what discourse, or in comparison of what else, or whither solely in reference

ference to the Roman succession, in which sense I will have nothing to doe with it, I know not at all; nor will concerne my selfe to enquire; being greatly ashamed to find men professing the Religion of Jesus Christ, so farre forgetfull of all common Rules of civility and principles of humane society, as to insist upon such *vaine groundlesse reports* as the Foundations of accusations against their Brethren! nor doe I believe that any one of the *Reverend Persons* quoted will owne this information, although I shall not concerne my selfe to make enquiry into their memories concerning any such passage or discourse.

Much relieſe for the *future* against these and the like mistakes may be afforded from an easy observation of the different senses wherein the terme of *Ordination* is often used; it is one thing when it is taken largely for the whole appointment of a man to the ministry; in which sense I desire our Authour to consider what is written by *Beza* among Reformed, and *Gerhard* among the *Lutherans*

therán Divines, to omit innumerable others; another thing when taken for the imposition of hand, whither by *Bishops* or *Presbyters*; concerning which *single Act*, both as to its *order*, & *efficacy*, I have sufficiently delivered my judgment, if he be pleased to take notice of it. I feare indeed that when men speak of an *ordained ministry*; which in its true and proper sense I shall with them contend for, they often relate only to that solemnity, restraining the authoritative making of ministers singly thereunto, contrary to the intention and meaning of that expression, in Scripture, antiquity, and the best reformed Divines, both *Calvinists*, and *Lutherans*, and yet it is not imaginable how some men prevaile by the noise and sound of that *Word*, upon the prejudiced minds of *partiall* unstudied men. A litle time may farther manifest, if it be not sufficiently done already; that another account is given of this matter, by *Clemens*, *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Origen*, *Justin Martyr*, and generally all the first writers of Christi-

ans; besides the Counsels of old & late, with innumerable *Protestant Authors* of the best note to the same purpose.

This I say is the ground of this mistake; whereas sundry things concurre to the *calling* of *Ministers*, as it belongs to the Church of God, the *ground and pillar of truth*, the *spouse of Christ*, Psal. 45. and *mother of the family*, *or she that tarryeth at home*, Psal. 68. *unto whom all ministers are stewards*, 1 Cor. 4. 1. even in that *house* of God, 1 *Tim.* 3. 15. and sundry *qualifications* are indispensably previously required in the persons to be called; overlooking the *necessity* of the qualifications required, and omitting the *duty* and *authority* of the Church, *Acts* 1.15. *Acts* 6.2. 13.2. 14.22. the Act of them who are not the *whole Church*, Ephes. 4. 11, 12. but only a *part* of it, 1 *Cor.* 3. 21. 2 *Cor.* 1. 24. 1 Pet. 5. 3. as to ministry, consisting in the approbation and solemne confirmation, of what is supposed to go before, hath in some mens language, gotten the name of *ordination*, and an interpretation

tion of that name to such an extent, as to *envrap* in it, all that is *indispensably* necessary to the constitution or making of *ministers*, so that where that is *obtained*, in what order soever, or by whom soever administred, who have first obtained it themselves, there is a lawfull and sufficient calling to the ministry. Indeed, I know no errour, about the institutions of Christ, attended with more pernitious consequences to the Church of God, then this, should it be practised, according to the force of the *principle* its selfe. Suppose six, eight, or ten men, who have themselves been formerly ordained, but now perhaps, not by any *ecclesiasticall censure*, but by an act of the civill *magistrate*, are put out of their places, for *notorious ignorance* and *scandall*, should concurre and ordaine an hundred ignorant and wicked persons like themselves, to be ministers: must they not on this Principle be all accounted *ministers* of Christ, and to be invested with all *ministeriall power*, and so be enabled to propagate

their kind to the end of the world, and indeed why should not this be granted, seeing the whole bulke of the *papall ordination* is contended for as valid, whereas it is notoriously knowne, that sundry *Bishops* among them (who perhaps received their own ordination as the *reward of a whore*) being persons of *vitious lives*, and utterly ignorant of the Gospell, did sustaine their pompe and sloth, by selling *holy orders* as they called them, to the *scum* and refuse of men; but of these things, more in their proper place.

Take then Reader, the substance of this chapter, in this briefe recapitulation.

1. *He denies our Churches to be true Churches, and our Ministers true Ministers.*

2. *He hath renounced his owne ordination.*

3. *When some young men came to advise about their ordination he diswaded them from it.*

4. *He saith he would maintaine a-*

gainst

gainst all the Ministers of England, there was in Scripture no such thing as Ordination.

5. *That when he was chosen a Parliament man he would not answer whether he was a Minister or not*; all which are *notoriously* untrue, and some of them, *namely* the *two last*, so remote from any thing to give a pretence or colour unto them, that I question whether *Satan* have impudence enough to owne himselfe their Author; and yet from *heare-sayes, reports, rumours, from table talk, Vox populi*, and such other grounds of Reasoning this Reverend Author hath made them his *owne*, and by such a *charge*, hath I presume, in the judgment of all unprejudiced men, *discharg'd* me from further attending to what he shall be prompted from the like principles to divulge, for the same end and purposes, which hitherto he hath managed, for the future. For my judgment about their ministry, and Ordination, about the nature and efficacy of Ordination, the state and power of particular Churches, my owne

ſtation in the miniſtry, which I ſhall at all times through the grace and aſſiſtance of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, freely juſtify againſt men and *devills*, it is ſo well knowne, that I ſhall not need here further to declare it: for the true nature and notion of *Schiſme*, alone by me enquired after, in this chapter, as I ſaid, I find nothing offerd thereunto: only whereas I reſtrained the Eccleſiaſticall uſe of the word *Schiſme* to the ſenſe wherein it is uſed; in the *places* of Scripture, that mention it with relation to Church affaires, which that it ought not to be ſo, nothing but *aſſeverations* to the contrary are produced to evince; this is interpreted, to extend to all that I would allow as to the nature of Schiſme it ſelfe, which is moſt falſe; though I ſaid if I would *proceed* no farther, I might not be compelled ſo to do, ſeeing in things of this nature we may crave allowance to *think* and ſpeak with the Holy Ghoſt: However, I expreſſely compriſed in my propoſition all the places wherein the *nature* of Schiſme is delivered under

what

what termes or words soever. When then I shall be convinced, that such discourses as those of this Treatise, made up of diversions into things wholy forraigne to the inquiry by me insisted on, in the investigation of the true notion and nature of Schisme, with long *talkes* about *Anabaptists*, *Brownists*, *Sectaries*, *Independents*, *Presbyterians*, *Ordination*, with charges and reflections grounded on this presumption, that this *Author* and his party, (for we will no more contend about that expression) are *in solidum* possessed of all true and orderly *Church state* in *England*, so that whosoever are not of them, are *Schismaticks*, and I know not what besides, he being

——— *Gallina filius alba*
nos viles pulli nati infelicibus ovis,

I shall farther attend unto them. I must farther adde that I was not so happy as to foresee that because I granted the *Roman* Party before the Reformation to have made outwardly a profession of the Religion of Christ, although I expressed them to be *really a party combined*

together, for all ends of *wickednesse*, and in particular for the *extirpation* of the true Church of Christ in the world, having no state of *union* but what the Holy Ghost calls *Babilon* in opposition to *Syon*, our Reverend Author would conclude as he doth *pag.* 34. that I allowed them to be a true Church of Christ; but it is impossible for wiser men then I, to see farre into the issue of such discourses; and therefore we must take in good part what doth fall out; and if the *Reverend Author*, insteed of having his *zeale warmed* against me, would a little bestirre his abilities, to make out to the understandings and consciences of *unintersted men*, that *All ecclesiasticall power* being vested in the Pope and *Councills*, by the consent of that whole combination of men called the *Church of Rome*, and flowing from the *Pope* in its execution to all others, who in the derivation of it from him, owned him as the immediate *fountaine* of it, which they sware to maintaine in *him*, and this in *opposition* to all Church power in a-

ny

ny other persons whatsoever; it was possible that any power should be derived from that combination, but what came expressely from the fountaine mentioned. I desire our Author would consider the frame of spirit that was in this matter, in them, who first laboured in the *worke of Reformation*, and to that end peruse the stories of *Lasitius*, and *Regenvolscius* about the Churches of *Bohemia*, *Poland*, and those parts of the world, especially the latter from *pag.* 29. 30. and forward. And as to the distinction used by some, between the *Papacy*, and the *Church of Rome*, which our *Author* makes use of to another purpose, then those did, who first invented it, (extending it only to the consideration of the possibility of salvation for individuall persons living in that communion before the Reformation) I hope he will not be angry if I professe my *disability* to understand it. All men cannot be wise alike; if the *Papacy* comprise the Pope, and all Papall Jurisdiction and power, with the sub-

subjection of men thereunto, if it denote all the *Idolatries*, *false worship*, and heresies of that *society* of men; I do know that all those are confirmed by *Church Acts* of that *Church*: and that in the *Church Publick sense* of that Church, no man was a member of it but by virtue of the union that consisted in that *Papacy*, it being placed alwaies by them in all their definitions of their Church, as also hat there was neither Church *Order*, nor Church *Power*, nor Church *Act*, nor Church *confession*, nor Church *Worship* amongst them, but what consisted in that *Papacy*.

Now because nothing doth more frequently, occurre then the objection of the difficulty in placing the dispensation of *baptisme* on a sure foot *account*, in case of the rejection of all *authoritative* influence from *Rome* into the ministry of the Reformed Churches, with the insinuation of a supposition of the *non-baptization* of all sutch, as derive not a title unto it, by that meanes, they who do so being supposed to stand upon an

unque-

unquestionable foundation, I shall a little examine the grounds of their *security*, and then compare them with what they have to plead, who refuse to *acknowledg* the deriving any sap or *nourishment* from that rotten corrupt stock.

It is I suppose, taken for granted, that an *unbaptized person* can never effectually *baptize*, let him receive what other qualifications soever that are to be superadded, or necessary thereunto. If this be not *supposed* the whole weight of the *objection* improved by the worst supposition that can be made, falls to the ground. I shall also desire in the next place, that as we cannot make the *Popish baptisme*, better then it is, so that we would not plead it to be *better*, or any other, then *they* professe it to be; nor pretend, that though it be *rotten* or *null* in the foundation, yet by *continuance* and time it might obtaine validity and strength. When the claime is by *succession* from such a *stock* or root, if you suppose once a *totall intercision* in the succession from that stock or root, there

is

is an utter end put to that claime, let us now consider how the case is with them from whom this claime is derived.

1. It is notoriously knowne, that amongst them the *validity* of the sacraments depends upon the intention of the *Administrator*: It is so with them, as to every thing they call a sacrament: now to take one step backwards: that *baptisme* will by some of ours, be scarce accounted *valid*, which is not administred by a *lawfull minister*, suppose now that some *Pope* ordaining a *Bishop* in his *stable* to satisfy a *Whore*, had not an intention to make him a *Bishop*, which is no remote surmise, he being no *Bishop* rightly ordained, all the *Priests* by him afterwards consecrated, were indeed no *priests*, and so indeed had no power to *administer* any *Sacraments*, and so consequently the baptisme that may lye, for ought we know, at the root of that which some of us pretend unto, was originally absolutely *null* and *void*, and could never by tract of time, be made *valid*, or effectuall, for like a muddy fountaine, the

the farther it goes, the more *filthy* it is: or suppose that any *Priest*, baptizing one who afterwards came to be *Pope* from whom all *Authority* in that Church doth flow and is *derived*, had no intention to *baptize* him? what will become of all that ensues thereon.

It is endlesse to *pursue* the uncertainties, and intanglements, that insue on this head of account; and sufficiently easy it is to manifest, that whosoever resolves his *interest* in Gospell priviledges, into this foundation, can have no assurance of faith nay nor tolerably probable conjecture that he is *baptized*, or was ever made *partaker* of any ordinance of the Gospell. Let them that delight in such *troubled waters*, sport themselves in them: for my owne part, considering the state of that *Church* for some yeares if not Ages, wherein the fountaines of all Authority amongst them, were full of filth and blood, there Popes upon their owne confession being *made*, *set up* and pulled downe at the *pleasure* of vile, impudent domineering *strumpets*, and sup-

supplying themselves with officers all the world over of the same spirit, and stamp with themselves, and that for the most part for hire, being in the meane time all *Idolaters to a man*; I am not willing to grant, that their *Good and upright* intention is necessary to be supposed as a thing requisite unto my interest in any priviledge of the Gospell of Christ.

2. It is an ecclesiasticall determination of irrefragable Authority amongst them, that whosoever he be that *administers baptisme*, so he use the *matter* and *forme*, that baptisme is *Good* and valid and not to be reiterated: yea *Pope Nicholas* in his Resolutions and determinations upon the enquiry of the *Bulgarians*, (whose decrees are authentick and recorded in their *Counsells*, Tom: 2. Crabb: p. 144.) declares the judgment of that *Church* to the full: They tell him, that many *in their Nation* were *baptized* by an *unknowne person*, *a Jew or a Pagan they knew not whether*, and enquire of him, whether they were to be

be rebaptized or no; whereunto he answers; *si in nomine S. S. Trinitatis, vel tantum in Christi nomine, sicut in Actis Apostolorum legimus, baptizati sunt, unum quippe idemque est, ut* S. Ambrosius *expressit, constat eos denuo non esse baptizandos:* if they were *baptized* in the name of *the Trinity* or of *Christ*, they are not to be baptized againe. Let a blasphemous *Jew* or *Pagan* do it, so it be done the work is *wrought*, grace conveyed, and baptisme valid. The constant practise of *women* baptizing amongst them, is of the same import: and what doth Mr *Cawdry* think of this *kind of Baptisme?* Is it not worth the contending about, to place it in the derived succession of ours? who knowes but that some of *these persons*, baptized by a counterfeit impostor, on purpose to abuse and defile the institutions of our blessed Saviour, might come to be baptizers themselves, yea Bishops, or Popes; from whom all ecclesiasticall Authority was to be derived; and what evidence or certainty can any man have, that his

baptisme

baptisme doth not flow from this fountaine.

3. Nay upon the Generall accoune, if this be *required* as necessary to the administration of that ordinance, that he that doth baptize, be rightly and effectually *baptized* himselfe; who can in faith bring an infant to any, to be baptized, unlesse he himselfe saw that person rightly baptized.

As to the matter of Baptisme then, we are no more concerned, then as to that of Ordination; by what waies or meanes soever any man comes to be a minister, according to the mind of Jesus Christ, by that way and meanes he comes to have power for a due administration of that ordinance: concerning which state of things, our Author may do well to consult *Beza* in the place mentioned. Many other passages there are in this Chapter, that might be remarked, and a returne easily made according to their desert of untruth and *impertinency*; but the insisting on such things, lookes more like childrens playing

ing at *pushpin*, then the management of a serious *disputation*: Take an instance; pag. 23. he seemes to be much offended with my commending him; and tells me, as *Jerome* said of *Ruffinus*, *I wrong him with prayses*; when yet the utmost I say of him is, that I had received a *better character of him*, then he had given of himselfe in his book, pag. 10. and that his proceeding was unbecoming his *worth, gravity and profession*, pag. 46. or so Grave and Reverend a person as he is reported to be, pag. 121. wherein it seemes I have transgressed the rule, μήτοτ' εὖ ἔρδειν γέροντα.

The businesse of his *second Chapter* is to make good his former charge of my *inconstancy* and *inconsistency* with my selfe as to my *former* and *present* opinions, which he had placed in the *Frontispiece* of his other Treatise. The *Impertinency* of this Chapter had beene intolerable, but that the *loose* discourses of it are relieved by a *scheme* of my *self-Contradictions* in the close. His designe, he professeth, in his *former discourse* was

not to *blast my Reputation*, or to *cause my person to suffer*, but to *prevent the prevalency of my way by the authority of my person*, That is, it was not his *intention*, it was only his intention for such a purpose. I blesse my God I have good security through Grace, that whether he, or others like minded with himselfe, intend any such thing or no, in those proceedings of his and theirs, which seemed to have in their owne nature, a tendency thereunto, my *reputation* shall yet be *preserved* in that state and Condition, as is necessary to *accompany* me in the duties and workes of my Generation, that I shall through the hand of God be called out unto; And therefore being prepared in some measure, to go through *good report* and *bad report*, I shall give him assurance, that I am very litle concerned in such attempts, from what ever intention they do proceed; Only I must needs tell him, that he consulted not his *owne reputation* with peaceable godly men; what ever else he omitted, in the ensuing Comparing

paring of me to the *seducers* in *Jude*, called *wandring Planets*, for their *inconstancy* and *inconsistency* with themselves, according to the exposition that was needfull for the present turne.

But seeing the *Scheme* at the close must beare the weight of this charge, let us briefly see what it amounts unto; and whether it be a sufficient *basis* of the sustruction, that is *raised* upon it; Hence it is, that my *inconsistency with my selfe*, must be remarked in the *title page* of his first Treatise; from hence must my *Authority* (which what it is I know not) be *impaired*, and my selfe be *Compared* to *cursed Apostates* and Seducers, and great *triumph* be made and upon my selfe inconsistency.

The Contradictions pretended are taken out of two bookes, the one written in the yeare 1643. The other in 1656. and are as followes.

He spake of Rome as a Collapsed, Corrupted Church-State. p. 40.	*He sales Rome we account no Church at all. pag. 156.*

Crimen inauditum C. Cæsar; is it meet that any one should be *tolerated*, that is thus *wofully* inconsistent with himselfe? what! speak of *Rome* as a *Collapsed Church in Italy*, and within thirteene, or fourteene *yeares* after to say, it is no *Church at* all; well! though I may say, there is indeed no *Contradiction* between these Assertions, seeing in the *latter* place I speak of *Rome* as that *Church* is stated by themselves, when yet I acknowledge there may be *corrupted Churches both in Rome and Italy* in the same Treatise; Yea I do not *find* that in the place directed unto, I have in *termes*, or in *just consequence* at all granted the *Church of Rome* to be a Collapsed Church: nay the *Church of Rome* is not once mentioned in the whole page, nor as such is spoken of: and what shall we think of this proceeding? But yet I will not so farre offend against my sense of my *owne weaknes, ignorance* and *frailty*, as to use any defensative against this Charge, let it passe at any rate that any sober man freed

from

from pride, passion, selfefulnesse, and prejudice shall be pleased to put upon it;

—ὁδὸ ὀρῶν τοὺς νόμους
λίαν ἀκριβῶς, συκοφάντης φαίνεται.

But the second *instance* will make amends, and take more of the weight of this Charge upon its shoulders: Take it then as it lies in its *triple Columne*.

Guifts in the Person, and consent of people, is warrant enough to make a man a preacher in an extraordinary Case? only pag. 15. and pag. 40.	*Denying our ordination to be sufficient, he sayes he may have that which indeed Constitutes him a minister, viz: Guifts and submission by the People* p. 198.	*I am punctually of the same mind still* p. 40. *Yet had said in his first book* p. 46. *as to formall teaching is required 1 Guifts, 2 Authority from the Church, if he do not equivocate.*

I must Confesse I am here at a stand, to find out the *pretended Contradiction*, especially laying aside the word *only* in the first *Columne* which is his and not mine. By a *Preacher* in the *first Place* I intend a *minister*: Guifts and Consent or *submission* of the People, I affirme in *both places* to be sufficient, to *constitute* a man a *minister* in extraordinary Cases;

That is, when imposition of *hands* by a Presbytery may not be obtained in due order according to the appointment of Jesus Christ. That the *Consent* and *submission* of the people, which include *Election*, have nothing of Authority in them I never said: the superadded Act of the *imposition of hands* by a *Presbytery*, when it may be regularly obtained, is also necessary. But that there is any *Contradiction* in my words, (although in truth they are not my words but an undue collection from them) or in this Authors inference from them, or any colour of *Equivocation*, I professe I cannot discerne: in this place Mr *Cawdrey* ἐυκ ἴδεν, ἀλλ' ἐδέκησεν ἰδεῖν διὰ νύκτα σελήνην. Passe we to the third.

He made the Union of Christ and believers to be mysticall pag. 21.	*He makes the Union to be Personall.* pag. 94. 95.

I wish our Reverend Author for his *owne sake*, had omitted this *Instance*; because I am enforced in mine *owne necessary defence* to let him know, that what he

he assignes to me in his *second Columne*, is *notoriously false*, denied, and disproved, by me in the very place, and Treatise wherein I have handled the Doctrine of the *Indwelling of the Spirit*, and whether he will *heare* or *forbeare*, I cannot but tell him, that this kind of dealing, is unworthy his *calling* and *profession*. His following Deductions and Inferences whereby he endeavours to give countenance to this *false and calumnious charge*, arise from ignorance of the Doctrine that he seeks to *blemish* and oppose. Though the same spirit dwell in Christ and us, yet *He* may have him in fullnesse, we in *measure*; *Fulnesse* and *measure* relating to his *Communication* of Graces and Gifts, which are *arbitrary* to him; *indwelling* to his person: that the Spirit animates the Catholick Church, and is the *Author* of its *spirituall life* by a voluntary act of his power, as the *soule* gives life to the body, by a necessary act, by virtue of its union, for life is *actus vivificantis in vivificatum per unionem utriusque*, is the

Common Doctrine of Divines. But yet the soule being united to the body, as *pars Essentialis suppositi*, and the spirit dwelling in the *Person* as a free inhabitant, The union between Christ and the *Person*, is not of the same *kind* with the union of *soule and Body*; let our Author Consult Zanchy on the second of the Ephesians, and it will not *repent* him of his *labour*; or if he please an Author whom I find him often *citing*, namely, *Bishop Hall* about union with Christ. And for my Concernment in this charge I shall subjoyne the words from whence it must be taken, *Pag.* 133. of my book of Perseverance.

1. *The first signall Issue and effect which is ascribed to this Indwelling of the Spirit, is Union, not a Personall Union with himselfe, which is impossible: He doth not assume our natures, and so prevent our Personality, which would make us one person with him, but dwells in our persons, keeping his owne, and leaving us our Personality infinitely distinct; But it is a spirituall Union, the great union men-*

mentioned so often in the Gospell, that is the sole Fountaine of our Blessednesse, our Union with the Lord Christ, which we have thereby. Many thoughts of heart there have been about this Union, what it is, wherein it doth consist, the causes, manner, and Effects of it, The Scripture expresses it to be very Eminent, neere, durable, setting it out, for the most part, by similitudes, and Metaphoricall Illustrations, to lead poore weak Creatures into some usefull needfull acquaintance with that Mystery, whose depths in this life, they shall never fathome. That many in the daies wherein we live, have miscarried in their conceptions of it, is evident, some to make out their Imaginary Union have destroyed the person of Christ, and fancying a way of uniting man to God by him, have left him to be neither God nor Man. Others have destroyed the Person of Believers, affirming that in their Union with Christ, they loose their owne personality, that is, cease to be Men: or at least, those, are these Individuall men.

I intend not now to handle it at large, but only (and that I hope without offence) to give in my thoughts concerning it, as farre as it receiveth light from, and relateth unto, what hath been before delivered, concerning the Indwelling of the Spirit, & that without the least contending about other waies of Expression. So far there; with much more to the purpose; & in the very place of my book of *Schisme*, referred to by this *Author*, I affirme as the head of what I assert, that by the indwelling of the spirit, *Christ personall* and his Church do become one Christ mysticall; 1 *Cor.* 12. 12. The very expression insisted on by him, in my former Treatise; and so you have an issue of this *selfe-Contradiction*, concerning which, though reports be urged for some other things, Mr *Cawdry* might have said what *Lucian* doth of his true History; γράφω τοίνυν περὶ ὧν μήτ' εἶδον, μήτ' ἔπαθον, μήτε παρ' ἄλλων ἠπυθόμην.

Let

Let us then consider the 4th which is thus *Placed*.

1. *In extraordinary cases every one that undertakes to preach the Gospell must have an immediate Call from God* pag. 28.

2. *Yet required no more of before but Gifts & Consent of the People which are ordinary, and mediate Calls* p. 25. *neither is here any need or use of an immediate Call*, pag. 53

3. *To assure a man that he is extraordinarily called, he gives 3 wayes, 1 Immediate revelation, 2 Concurrence of Scripture rule. 3 Some extraordinary act of Providence.* The two last whereof are *mediate Calls*, pag. 30.

All that is here *remarked* and Cast into 3 *Columnes*, I know not well why, is taken out of that *one Treatise* of the *duty* of *Pastours* & *People*. And could I give my selfe the least *Assurance* that any one would so farre concerne himselfe in this *Charge*, as to Consult the *Places* from whence the words are Pretended to be *taken*, to see whether there be any thing in them to *answer* the *cry* that is made, I should *spare* my selfe the labour of adding any one *syllable* towards their vindication; and might most *safely*

ly so doe, there being not the least colour of *opposition* betweene the things spoken of. In briefe *Extraordinary Cases* are not all of one sort and nature, in some an *extraordinary call* may be required, in some not. *Extraordinary calls* are not all of one kind and nature neither; some may be *immediate* from God in the wayes there by me described, some *calls* may be said to be *extraordinary*, because they doe in some things come short of, or goe beyond the *ordinary rule* that ought to be observed in well *Constituted Churches*. Againe, *concurrence of Scripture rules* and acts of outward Providence, may be such sometimes, as are suited to an *ordinary*, sometimes to an *extraordinary* Call; All which are at *large* unfolded in the Places directed unto by our Authour, and all laid in their *owne order* without the least shadow of Contradiction. But it may sometimes be said of good men as the Satyrist said of evill Women; *fortem animum præstant rebus quas turpiter audent.* Goe we to the next.

1. *The Church Government from which I desire you to wander is the Presbyteriall.*

2. He now is ingaged in the independent way.

3. *Is settled in this way which he is ready to maintain and knows it will be found his rejoycing in the day of the Lord Jesus.*

Hinc mihi sola mali labes: This is that *inexpiable* crime that I labour under; an account of this whole businesse I have given in my Review; So that I shall not here trouble the *Reader* with a repetition of what he is so litle concerned in. I shall only adde that whereas I suppose Mr *Cawdrey* did subscribe unto the 39 Articles at his Ordination, were it of any concernement to the Church of God, or the interest of truth, or were it a *Comely* and a *Christian part* to engage in such a worke, I could manifest *Contradictions*, between what he then solemnly *subscribed* to, and what he hath since *written* and *Preached*, manyfold above what he is able to draw out of this alteration of my Judgment. Be it

here

here then declared, that whereas I sometimes apprehended the *Presbyterial Synodicall Government* of Churches, to have been fit to be *received* and walked in, (then, when I knew not but that it answered those principles which, I had taken up, upon my best enquiry into the word of God) I now professe my selfe to be *satisfied*, that I was then under a mistake; and that I doe now *own*, and have for many yeares lived in the way and *practice* of that called *Congregationall*. And for this Alteration of Judgment, of all men, I feare least a *Charge* from them, or any of them, whom within a few yeares, we saw reading the service book in their surplices, &c: against which things, they doe now *inveigh* and declame. What influence the perusall of Mr *Cotton's* Booke of the *Keyes*, had on my thoughts in this businesse I have formerly declared. The *answer to it* (I suppose that written by himselfe) is now recommended to me by this *Author*, as that which would have perhaps prevented my Change;

But

But I must needs tell him, that as I have perused that *book, many yeares agoe*, without the Effect intimated, so they must *be things* written with an other *frame of spirit*, evidence of truth, and manner of reasoning, then any I can find in that booke, that are likely for the future, to lay hold upon my *Reason* and understanding. Of my settlement in my present Perswasion I have not only given him an account formerly, but with all Christian *Courtesy*, tendred my selfe in a readinesse *Personally* to meet him, to give him the proofes and reasons of my *my perswasions*, which he is pleased to decline & returne in way of *answer*, That I *Complemented* him, *after the mode of the* times; when no such thing was intended. And therefore my words of *desiring liberty to waite upon him*, are expressed, but the end and purpose for which it was defired, are concealed, in an &c. But he addes another instance.

Men

Men ought not to cut themselves from the communion of the Church, to rent the body of Christ and breake the sacred bond of Charity; Duty. 1.48.

2. *He says Separation is no Schisme, nor Schisme any breach of Charity*, pag. 48. 49.

There is not one word in either of these cautions, that I do not still owne and allow. p. 44. *sure not without Equivocation.*

I have before owned this *Caution*, as consistent with my present Judgment, as expressed in my Booke of *schisme* and as it is indeed; wherein lyes the appearance of *Contradiction* I am not able to discerne: Doe not I in my *Booke of Schisme* Declare and prove, that men ought not to cut themselves from the *Communion of the Church*; That they ought not *to rent the body of Christ*, that they ought not to *breake the sacred bonds of Charity*? Is there any word or tittle in the *whole Discourse* deviating from these Principles? How and in what sense, *Separation is not Schisme*, that the *nature of Schisme* doth not consist in *a breach of Charity*, the Treatise instanced will so farre declare, as withall to Con-

Convince those that shall Consider what is spoken, that our *Authour* scarce keeps close either to *Truth* or *Charity* in his framing of this *Contradiction*: The Close of the Scheme lies thus.

I conceive they ought not at all to be allowed the benefit of private meeting, who willfully abstaine from the publick Congregations.

As for liberty to be allowed to those that meet in private, I confesse myself to be otherwise minded.

I remember that about 15 *yeeres* agoe, meeting occasionally with a *learned Friend*, we fell into some debate, about the *liberty* that began then to be claimed by men, differing from what had been, and what was then likely to be *established*, having at that time made no farther *enquiry* into the grounds and reasons of such liberty, then what had occurred to me in the writings of the Remonstrants, all whose *plea* was still pointed towards the advantage of their owne interest, I delivered my Judgment in *opposition to the liberty* pleaded for, which was then defended by my

learned Friend; Not many yeares after, discoursing the same difference with the *same Person*, we found immediately that we had *changed Stations*; I pleading for an *Indulgence* of liberty, he for restraint; whether that *learned* and *worthy* Person be of the same mind still that then he was, or no, directly I know not: But this I know, that if he be not, Considering the *Compasse* of Circumstances that must be taken in, to settle a right *Judgment* in this *Case of Liberty*, and what alterations influencing the Determination of this *Case* we have had of late in this nation, he will not be *ashamed* to owne his Change; Being a *Person* who despises any reputation, but what arises from the *Embracing* and pursuit of truth; my Change I here owne; my Judgment is not the same in this Particular, as it was 14 yeeres ago; and in my Change I have good Company whome I need not to name. I shall only say my Change was at least 12 yeares before the *Petition and Advice*; wherein the Parliament of the three Nations, is come

come up to my judgment: And if Mr *Cawdrey*, hath any thing to *object* to my Present Judgment, let him at his next leisure Consider the Treatise that I *wrote* in the yeare 1648, about *Toleration*, where he will find the whole of it expressed: I suppose he will be doing, and that I may almost say of him, as *Polycteutus* did of *Speusipus*; *εἰ μὴ δύναθαι ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν ὑπὸ τῆς τύχης ἐν πεντασυρίγνῳ νυσῳδεδεμένον*. And now *Christian Reader* I leave it to thy Judgment whether our Author had any just cause, of all his outcryes, of my *inconstancy and selfe-Contradiction*; and whether it had not been advisable for him to have passed by this seeming advantage of the designe he professed to mannage, rather than to have injured his owne *Conscience* and Reputation to so litle purpose.

Being sufficiently tired with the consideration of things of no relation to the Cause at first proposed (but, *this saith he*, this the *independents*, this the *Brownists* and *Anabaptists* &c.) I shall

now only *enquire* after that which is set up in opposition to any of the principles of my *Treatise* of *Schisme* before mentioned, or any of the *propositions* of the *syllogismes* wherein they are comprized, at the beginning of this Discourse; remarking in our way some such particular passages, as it will not be to the *disadvantage* of our Reverend Authour to be reminded of. Of the nature of the thing enquired after, in the third Chapter I find no mention at all; only he tels me by the way, that the *Doctor's* assertion that my Booke about *Schisme*, was *one great schisme*, was not *non sense*, but *usuall Rhetoricke*, wherein *profligate sinners* may be called by the *name of sin*; and therefore a Booke about *Schisme*, maybe called a *schisme*; I wish our Authour had found some other way of excusing his *Doctor*, then by making it worse himselfe.

In the *fourth Chapter* he comes to the businesse it selfe; and if in passing thorough *that*, with the rest that follow, I can fix on any thing rising up with any

any pretence of opposition to what I have *laid down*, it shall not be omitted, for things by my selfe asserted, or acknowledged on all hands, or formerly ventilated to the utmost, I shall not againe trouble the *Reader* with them: such are the positions about the *generall* nature of *Schisme*, in things *naturall* and *politicall*, antecedently considered to the limitation and restriction of it to it's *Ecclesiasticall* use; the departure from Churches *voluntary* or *compelled* &c: all which were *stated* in my first Treatise, and are not directly opposed by our Authour; such also is that doughty *Controversie* he is pleased to raise, and pursue about the *seat* and *subject* of Schisme with it's restriction to the *instituted worship of God*, pag. 18. 19: so placed by me, to distinguish *the Schisme* whereof we speake, from that which is *naturall*, as also from such *differences* and breaches as may fall out amongst *men*, few or more, upon *civill* and rationall accounts; all which I exclude from the enjoyment

of any *reame* or place in our consideration of the true nature of *schisme* in it's limited *Ecclesiasticall sense*. The like also may be affirmed concerning the ensuing strife of words about *separation* and *schisme*, as though they were in my apprehension of them, inconsistent; which is a *fancy* no better *grounded* than sundry other, which our *Reverend Author* is pleased to make use of. His whole passage also receives no other *security*, than what is afforded to it by turning my *universall proposition* into a *particular*: what I say of *all places* in the Scripture where the *name or thing* of *schisme* is used in an *ecclesiasticall* sense, as relating to a *Gospell Church*, he would restraint to that one place of the *Corinths* where *alone* the word is used, in that sense: However if that one place be all, my proposition is *universall*: take then my proposition in it's extent and latitude, and let him try *once more* if he please, what he hath to object to it, for as yet I find no instance produced to alleviate it's truth. He much also in-

sists

sists, that there may be a *separation in a Church* where there is no *separation from a Church*, and saith this was at *first by me denyed*: that it was denyed by me he cannot prove; but that the contrary was *proved* by me is evident to all impartiall men, that have Considered my Treatise; although I cannot allow that the *separation* in the Church of *Corinth* was carried to that height as is by him pretended, namely as to *seperate from the ordinances of the Lord's supper*; their disorder and division *about* and in it's *Administration* are reproved, not their separation from it: only on that supposition made, I confesse I was somewhat surprised with the delivery of his judgment in reference to many of his *owne party*, whom he condemnes of *schisme* for not administring the *Lord's supper* to all the Congregation, with whom they pray and preach. I suppose the greatest part of the most godly and able ministers of the *Persbyterian* way in *England*, and *Scotland*, are here cast into the same condition of

Schismaticks with the Independents. And the truth is, I am not yet without hopes of seeing a faire coalescency in love, and Church Communion, between the reforming *Presbyterians* and Independents; though for it they shall with some, suffer under the unjust imputation of schisme.

But it is incredible to think whither men will suffer themselves to be carried *studio partium*; and ἀμνησία ἀγθολικὴ; Hence have we the strange notions of this Authour about Schisme; decaies in Grace are Schisme, and *errours in the Faith* are *Schisme*; and Schisme and *Apostacy* are things of the same kind, differing only in degree; because the one leades to the other; as one sinne of one kind doth often to another; drunkennesse to whoredome, and envy and malice to lying; that *differences* about civile matters, like that of *Paul* and *Barnabas* are schisme; and this by one blaming me for a departure from the sense of *antiquity*, unto which these *insinuations* are so many monsters. Let us then proceed.

That

That *Acts* 14. 4. *Acts* 19. 9, 18: are pertinently used to discover & prove the nature of Schisme in an *evangelically ecclesiasticall sense* or were ever cited by any of the *Antients* to that purpose, I suppose our Authour on second consideration will not affirme. I understand not the sense of this Argument, *the multitude of the city was divided, and part held with the Jewes, and part with the Apostle*, therefore Schisme in a Gospell Church state, is not only a division in a Church; or that it is a separation into new Churches, or that it is something more than the breach of the Union appointed by Christ in an instituted Church; much lesse doth any thing of this nature appeare from *Paul's seperating the Disciples* whom he had converted to the Faith from the unbelieving hardened *Jewes*, an account whereof is given us, *Act.* 19. 9. So then that in this Chapter there is any thing produced *de novo* to prove that the precise Scripture notion of Schisme in it's ecclesiasticall sense, extends it selfe any further than differences

ferences, divisions, separations in a Church and that a particular Church I find not; and doe once more desire our Authour that if he be otherwise minded, to spare such another trouble to our selves, and others, as that wherein we are now engaged, he would assigne me some *time and place* to attend him for the clearing of the truth between us.

Of Schisme *Act.* 20. 30. *Heb.* 10. 28. *Jud.* 19. there is no mention; nor are those places interpreted of any such thing by any Expositors *new* or *old*, that ever I yet saw; nor can any sense be imposed on them enwrapping the nature of *Schisme* with the least colour or pretence of Reason.

But now by our Authour, Schisme and Apostacy, are made things of on kind, differing only in degrees, *pag.* 107. so confounding *Schisme* and *heresy*, contrary to the Constant sense of all antiquity. *Act.* 20. 30. The Apostle speakes, of men speaking *perverse things*, *to draw away Disciples*; that is teaching them false doctrines, contrary to the

truths

truths wherein they had been by him instructed; in his *Revealing unto them the whole counsell of God.* vers. 27. This by the *Antients* is called *heresie*, and is contradistinguished unto *Schisme* by them constantly: So *Austin* an 100 times. To draw men from the Church, by drawing them into *pernitious errours*, *false doctrine*, being the cause of their *falling off*, is not *schisme*, nor so called in Scripture, nor by any of the Antients, that ever yet I observed. That the designe of the *Apostle* in the Epistle to the *Hebrewes*, is to preserve and keep them from *Apostasie* unto *Judaisme*, besides that it is attested by a cloud of witnesses, is to evident from the thing it selfe to be denyed. *chapt.* 10. 25: he warnes them of a common entrance into that fearfull condition, which he describes, *vers.* 26: their neglect of the *Christian Assemblies*, was the doore of their Apostacy to *Judaisme*. what is this to *schisme*? would we charge a man with that crime whom we saw neglecting our assemblies, and likely to fall into *Judaisme*

daisme; are there not more forceable considerations to deale with him upon; and doth not the Apostle make use of them? *Jude.* 19: hath been so farre spoken unto already, that it may not fairely be insisted on againe. *Parvas habet spes Troja, si tales habet.*

In the entrance of the *fifth* Chapter he takes advantage from my question, p. 147. *who told him that raising causelesse differences in a Church, and then separating from it, is not in my judgment schisme*; when the first part of the *assertion*, included in that interrogation, expresseth the *formal* nature of Schisme, which is not destroyed, nor can any man be exonerated of it's guilt, by the subsequent crime of separation, whereby it is aggravated. 1 *Joh.* 2. 19: is againe mentioned to this *purpose* of *schism*, to as little purpose, so also is *Heb.* 10. 25: both places treat of Apostates, who are charged and blamed under other termes than that of *Schisme*. There is in such departures, as in every division whatever, of that which was in Union

tion, somewhat of the generall nature of *schisme*, but that particular crime and guilt of schisme in it's restrained Ecclesiasticall sense, is not included in them.

In his following discourse he renewes his former Charges of denying their ordinances and *ministry*, of *separating* from them and the like; as to the former part of this Charge I have spoken in the entrance of this *discourse*; for the *latter*, of *separating from them*, I say we have no more separated from them, then they have from us; our *right* to the celebration of the ordinances of God's worship, according to the light we have received from him, is in this nation as good as theirs; and our plea from the Gospell we are ready to maintaine against them, according as we shall at any time be called thereunto. If any of our judgment deny them to be *Churches*, I doubt not but he knowes who comes not behind in returnall of Charges on our Churches. Doth the Reverend Authour thinke or imagine, that we have not in our owne judgment more reason to deny

their

their *Churches* and to charge them *with Schisme* though we doe neither, then they have to charge us therewith, and to deny our Churches? can any thing be more fondly Pretended than that he hath proved that we have separated from them; upon which, *pag.* 105, he requires the performance of my promise to retreat from the state wherein I stand, upon the establishment of such proofe. Hath he proved the due administration of Ordinances amongst them whom he pleads for? Hath he proved any Church Union betweene them *as such*, and us? hath hath he proved as to have broken that *Union*? what will not selfe-fulnesse and prejudice put men upon?

How came they into the sole *possession* of all Church state in *England*; so that who ever is not of them, and with them must be charged to have separated from them; Mr *Cawdrey* sayes indeed, that *the Episcopall* men and they agree in *substantialls*, and differ only in *circumstantials*; but that they and we differ in *substantials*; but let him know they admit

mit not of his *compliances*, they say he is a *Schismatick*, and that all his party are so also; let him answer their Charge *solidly* upon his owne principles; and not thinke to owne that which he hath the weakest *claime* imaginable unto, and was never yet in possession of. We deny that since the Gospell came into *England*, the *Presbyterian Government* as by them stated, was ever set up in *England*, but in the *wils* of a party of men; so that here as yet, unlesse as it lyes in *particular Congregations*, where our right is as good as theirs, none have *separated* from it, that I know of; though many cannot *consent* unto it. The first *Ages* we plead ours, the following were unquestionably *Episcopall*.

In the beginning of Chapter the 6: he attempts to disprove my assertion that the *Union of the Church Catholick visible* which consists in the professing of the saving doctrine of the Gospell, &c: is broken only by Apostacy: to this end he confounds Apostacy and Schisme, affirming them only to differ in degrees; which

which is a *new* notion unknowen to Antiquity and contrary to all sound Reason; by the instances he produceth to this purpose he endeavours to *prove* that there are things which break this union, whereby this union is not broken; whilst a man continues a member of that church which he is by virtue of the union thereof, and his intereſt therein, by no act doth he, or can he break that union.

The partiall breach of that union which consists in the *profession* of the truth, is *error* and heresy and not *Schisme*. Our Author abounds here in new notions which might easily be discovered to be as fond, as new, were it worth while to consider them; of which in briefe, before. Only I wonder why giving way to such thoughts as these, he should speak of men with contempt under the name of *Notionists*, as he doth of Dr *Du Moulin*; but the truth is, the *Doctor* hath provoked him, and were it not for some considerations that are obvious to me, I should almost wounder, why this *Author* should sharpen his leasure and *zeale*

against

against me, who scarse ever publickly touched the grounds and foundations of that Cause which he hath so passionately espoused, and pase by him, who both in *Latine* and *English*, hath laid his Axe to the very Root of it, upon principles *sufficiently destructive* to it, and so apprehended, by the best learned in our Authors way, that ever these nations brought forth; but as I said, Reasons lye at hand, why it was more *necessary* to give me this opposition; which yet hath not altered my Resolution, of handling this controversy in *another manner*, when I meet with *another manner* of Adversary.

Pag. 110. He fixes on the examination of a particular passage about the *disciples* of *John* mentioned *Acts* 19. 2. of whom I affirmed that it *is probable* they were rather ignorant of the miraculous dispensations of the Holy Ghost, then of the person of the Holy Ghost; alledging to the contrary that the words are more plaine and *full then to be so eluded, and that for ought appeares,*

John did not baptize into the name of the Holy Ghost: I hope the *Author* doth not so much dwell at home, as to suppose this to be a *new notion* of mine; who almost of late in their *criticall notes* have not either (at least) considered it, or confirmed it? neither is the question *into whose name* they were expressely baptized, but in what doctrine they were instructed: He knowes who denies that they were at all actually *baptized*, before they were baptized by *Paul*. Nor ought it to be granted without better proofe then any as yet hath been produced, that any of the *Saints* under the old Testament, were ignorant of the *being of the Holy Ghost*. neither do the words require the sense by him insisted on; ἀλλ' οὐδὲ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἦν, οὐπω ἦμεν, do no more evince the *person of the Holy Ghost* to be included in them, then in those other *Joh.* 7. 39. οὔπω γὰρ ἦν πνεῦμα ἅγιον; the latter in the proper sense He will not contend for; nor can therefore, the expression being uniforme, reasonably for the latter. Speaking of men openly and notoriously

toriously wicked, and denying them to be *members of any Church* whatever: he bids me, *answer his arguments to the contrary from the* 1 Cor. 5. 7. 2 Thes. 13. 17. and I cannot but desire him that he would impose that task on them that have nothing else to do: for my owne part, I shall not intangle my selfe with things to so little purpose. Having promised my Reader to attend only to that which looks toward the *merit of the cause*, I must crave his pardon, that I have not been able to make good my resolution: meeting with so little or nothing at all which is to that purpose, I find my selfe entangled in the old diversions that we are now plentifully accustomed unto: but yet I shall endeavour to recompence this losse, by putting a speedy period to this whole trouble, despairing of being able to tender him any other satisfaction, whilst I dwell on this discourse. In the meane time to obviate all strife of words if it be possible for the future, I shall grant this Reverend Author that in the generall large notion of *Schisme*

which his opposition to that insisted on by me hath put him upon, I will not deny but that *He*, and *I* are both *Schismaticks*, and any thing else shall be so, that he would have to be so, rather then to be engaged in this contest any farther. In this sense he affirmes that there was a *Schisme* between *Paul* and *Barnabas*, and so one of them at least, was a *Schismatick*; as also he affirmes the same of a *lesser* men, though great in their generation *Chrysostome* and *Epiphanius*; so errot and heresy, if he please shall be *Schisme* from the Catholick Church, and *scandall* of life shall be *Schisme*: And his argument shall be true, that schisme is a breach of union in a Church of Christs institution, therefore in that which is so only by call, not to any end of joynt worship as such; of any union; that which consists in the *profession* of the saving truths of the Gospell, and so there may be a schisme in the *Catholick Church*; and *so those Presbyterians* that reforme their Congregations, and do not administer the sacraments to all promiscuously, shall be

be guilty of Schisme, and indeed, as to me, what *else he pleaseth*, for my inquiry concernes only the *precise limited nature of Schisme*, in its evangelically ecclesiasticall sense.

Neither shall I at present, (alloting very few houres to the dispatch of this businesse, which yet I judge more then it deserves) consider the scattered ensuing passages about *Ordination*, *Church Government*, *number of Elders*, and the like, which all men know, not at all to belong unto the maine controversy which was by me undertaken; and that they were against all lawes of disputation, plucked violently into this contest, by our Reverend Author. One thing I cannot passe by, and it will upon the matter put a *close* to what I shall at present offer to this Treatise, having said that Christ hath given no direction for the *performance of any duty of worship of soveraigne institution*, but only in them and by them (meaning particular Churches) he answers that, if *I would imply that a Minister in or of a*

Particular Church, may performe those ordinances without those congregations, he contradicts himselfe for saying a particular Church is the seate of all ordinances, but why so, I pray? may not a particular Church be the seat of all ordinances *subjectively*, and yet others be the *object* of them, or of some of them? but saith he, *if he meane those ordinances of worship are to be performed only by a minister of a particular congregation, what shall become of the people?* I suppose they shall be *instructed* and built up according to the mind of Christ, and what would people desire more. But whereas he had before said, that I denyed *a Minister to be a Minister to more then his own Church* and I had asked him *who told him so*, adding that explication of my judgment, that for *so much as men are appointed the objects of the dispensation of the word, I grant a Minister in the dispensation of it to act ministerially, towards not only the members of the Catholick Church, but the visible members of the world also in contradistinction thereunto*, he now tells me

me a story of passages between the *learned* Dr Wallis *and my selfe about his question in the Vespers* 1654. namely that as to that question (*An potestas ministri Evangelici ad unius tantum ecclesiæ particularis membra extendatur?* I said that, Dr Wallis *had brought me a challenge, and that If I did dispute on that question, I must dispute* ex animo; although I grant that a Minister as a Minister may *preach* the word, to more then those of his owne congregation, yet knowing the sense wherein the *learned* Dr *VVallis* maintained that question, it is not impossible, but I might say, if I did dispute I must do it *ex animo*, for *his bringing me a challenge*, I do not know that either he did so, or that I put that interpretation on what he did, but I shall crave leave to say, that if the *learned* Dr *VVallis* do find any ground, or *occasion* to bring a *challenge* unto me, to debate any point of difference between us, I shall not wave answering his desire, although he should bring Mr *Cawdry* for his second; for the present I shall only

say, that as it is no commendation to the moderation or ingenuity of any one whatever, thus to publish to the world private heareſaies, and what he hath been *told* of private conferences; ſo if I would inſiſt on the ſame courſe, to make publication of what I have been told hath been the private diſcourſe of ſome men, it is not unlikely that I ſhould occaſion their ſhame and trouble: yet in this courſe of proceeding a progres is made in the enſuing words; and Mr *Stubbes* (who is now called my *Amanuenſis*, who ſome five yeares ago, tranſcribed about *a ſheete of paper for me*, and not one line, before or ſince;) is ſaid to be *employed or at leaſt encouraged* by me to write againſt the *learned* Dr *Wallis* his *Theſis* being publiſhed; this is as true as much of that that went before, and as ſomewhat of that, that followes after; and whereas it is added that I ſaid what he had written on that ſubject, was *a ſcurrilous ridiculous piece*, it is of the ſame nature with the reſt of the like reports. I knew that Mr

Stubbes

Stubbes was writing on that subject; but not untill he had *proceeded* farre in it; I neither *imployed* him, nor *encouraged him* in it, any otherwise then the consideration of his *papers*, after he had written them, may be so interpreted; and the reason why I was not willing he should proceed, next to my desire of continuance of *peace* in this place, was his using *such expressions of me*, and somethings of mine, in sundry places of his discourse, as I could not *modestly* allow to be divulged; the following words to the same purpose with them before mentioned, I remember not; nor did ever think to be engaged in the consideration of such transgressions of the common rules of *humane society* as those now passed through; Reports, heresayes, talkes, private discourse between friends, allegations countenanced by none of these, nor any thing else, are the weapons wherewith I am assaulted. *I have heard, I am told, if reports be* true, twas *vox populi at Oxford, is it not so, I presume he*

he will not deny it, are the ornaments of this discourse: strange! that men of experience and gravity should be carried by the power of these temptations not only to the *forgetfulnesse* of the royall law of Christ, and all Gospell rule of deportment towards his professed Disciples: but also be ingaged into *wayes* and practises, contrary to the dictates of the law of nature, and such as sundry heathens would have abhorred. For my owne part, had not God by his providence placed me in that station, wherein others also that feare him are concern'd in me, I should not once turne aside to looke upon such heapes as that which I have now passed over: my judgment in most heads and articles of Christian Religion is long since published to the world, and I continue through the grace and patience of God preaching in publick answerably to the principles I doe professe; and if any man shall oppose what I have delivered, or shall so deliver, in print or in the pulpit, or in divinity lectures, as my judg-

judgment, I shall consider his opposition, and doe therein, as God shall guide: with evill surmises, charges upon heare-sayes, and reports, attended with perpetuall excursions from the Argument in hand, I shall no more contend.

Some few observations on scattered passages, will now speedily issue this discourse. *Pag.* 112. To that Assertion of mine, that if *Rome* be no particular Church, it is no Church at all, for the Catholicke Church it is not, he replyes that *though it be not such a particular Congregation* as I intend, yet it may be *a particular Patriarchall Church*: but, 1: then it seemes it is a particular Church, which grants my inference.

2. It was a particular Church *of Christ's institution*, that I inquired after; doth our Authour think that Christ hath appointed any *Patriarchall Church*? a *Patriarchall Church*, as such, is such from it's Relation to a *Patriarch*: and he can scarce be thought to judge Patriarches to be of *Divine institution*, who

who hath caſt off and abjured Epiſcopacy.

The *Donatiſts* are mentioned againe, *p.* 113. And I am againe Charged with an attempt to vindicate them from ſchiſme; my thoughts of them I have before declared to the full; & have no reaſon to retract any thing from what was then ſpoken, or to adde any thing thereunto; if it may ſatisfie our Authour, I here grant they were *Schiſmatickes*, with what aggravations he pleaſeth; & wherein their *ſchiſme* conſiſted, I have alſo declared: but he ſayes, I undertake to exempt ſome others from ſchiſme (*I know whom*) that ſuffer with them in former and after ages, under the ſame imputation; I doe ſo indeed, and I ſuppoſe our *Authour* may *gheſſe* at whom I intend: himſelfe amongſt others; I hope he is not ſo taken up in his thoughts, with charging ſchiſme on others, as to forget, that many, the greateſt part and number of the true Churchs of Chriſt doe condemne him for a Schiſmatick; a *Donatiſticall* Schiſmatick:

matick: I suppose he acknowledges the Church of *Rome* to be a true Church; the *Lutheran* *I* am perswaded he will not deny, nor perhaps the *Grecian*, to be so: The *Episcopall* Church of England, he contends for; and yet all these with *one voice* cry out upon him for a *Schismaticke*: and as to the plea of the last, how he can satisfie his conscience, as to the rejection of his lawfull *superiors*, upon his owne principles, without pretending any such crime against them, as the *Donatists* did against *Caecilianus*, *I* professe *I* do not understand: new mention is made of *Episcopall Ordination*, p. 120, And they are said to have had their successive ordination from *Rome* who ordained therin, so indeed some say, and some otherwise, whether they had or no, is nothing to me, I lay no weight upon it; they held *I* am sure, that place in England, that without their approbation no man could publickly, preach the Gospell, to say they were *Presbyters*, and ordained as *Presbyters*, *I* know not what satisfaction can arise

rise unto *Conscience* thereby. Party and argument, may be countenanced by it; they professe they ordained *as Bishops*, that for their lives and soules they durst not ordaine but as such; so they told those whom they ordained, and affirme they have open injury done them, by any ones deniall of it: As it was, the best is to be made of it, this shift is not handsome, nor is it ingenious, for any one, that hath looked into *Antiquity*, to charge me with departing from their sense in the notion of *schisme*, declared about the 3d & 4th Ages, & at the same time to maintaine an *equality* between *Bishops* and *Presbyters*; or to say that *Bishops* ordained as *Presbyters*, not as *Bishops*: nor doe *I* understand the excellency of that order which we see in some Churches, where they have two sorts of Elders; the one made so, by *ordination* without *Election*, and the other by *Election* without *ordination*; those who are ordained, casting off all power and Authority of them that ordained them; and those who are elected, immediately

mediately rejecting the greateſt part of thoſe that *choſe* them.

Nor did I, as is pretend, plead for their *Presbyterian* way in the yeare 46; all the miniſters (almoſt) in the county of Eſſex, know the contrary; one eſpecially, who being a man of great ability, and moderation of ſpirit, and for his knowledge in thoſe things, not behind any man, *I* know, in *England* of his way, with whome in that yeare, and the next following, *I* had ſundry conferences at publicke meetings of miniſters, as to the *ſeverall wayes* of Reformation, then under propoſall. But the frivolouſneſſe of theſe imputations, hath been ſpoken of before, as alſo the falſneſſe of the Calumny, which our Authour is pleaſed to repeat againe, about my turning from wayes in Religion.

My deſcription of a particular Church he once more blames as applicable to the *Catholicke Church inviſible*, and to *the viſible Catholick Church* (I ſuppoſe he meanes as ſuch) when a participation in the ſame ordinances numerically, is aſ-

ſigned

signed as its difference; He askes, whether it becomes my ingenuity, to interpret the *capability* of a *Churches* reduction to it's primitive constitution, by its *owne fitnesse* and capacity to be so reduced, rather then by its *externall hinderances* or furtherances; But with what ingenuity or modesty, that question is asked, I professe I understand not; and *pag.* 134, he hath this passage: *(only I take notice of his introduction, to his answer*, with thankes for the civility of the inquiry in the manner of its expresion; *my words were these: whether our Reverend Authour doe not in his conscience thinke there was no true Church in England 'till, &c, which puts me into suspition, that the Reverend Doctour was offended, that I did not alwaies (for oft I doe) give him that title, of the Reverend Authour, or the Doctor, which made him cry out he was never so dealt withall by any party as by me, though upon review, I doe not find, that I gave him any uncivill language, unbeseeming me to give or him to receive, and I heare that some-*

somebody hath dealt more uncivilly with him in that respect, which he took very ill.

Let this Reverend Authour, make what use of it he please, I cannot but againe tell him, that these things become neither *him*, nor any man professing the *Religion of Jesus Christ*, or that hath any respect to *truth* or sobriety; can any man thinke, that in his conscience, he gives any credit to the insinuation which here he makes, that I should thanke him for calling me *Reverend Authour*, or *Reverend Doctor*, or be troubled for his not useing those expressions? Can the mind of an *honest man* be thought to be conversant with such *meane* and *low thoughts?* for the Title of Reverend, I doe give him notice that I have very little valued it, ever since I have considered the saying of *Luther*; *Nunquam periclitatur Religio nisi inter Reverendissimos.* So that he may as to me forbeare it for the future, and call me, as the *Quakers* doe, and it shall suffice. And for that of *Doctor*, it was conferred on me by the *University* in my *absence*,

and against my *consent*, as they have expressed it under their *publicke* seale: nor doth any thing but *gratitude*, and *respect* unto them, make me once own it, and freed from that obligation, I should never use it more, nor did I use it, untill some were offended with me, & blamed me for my neglect of them. And for that *other*, whom he mentions, who before this, gave so farre place to *indignation*, as to insinuate some such thing, I doubt not but by this time he hath beene *convinced* of his mistake therein, being a *Person* of another manner of ability and worth, then *some others*, with whom I have to doe, and the truth is, my manner of dealing with him in my *last reply*, which I have since my selfe not so well approved of, requires the *passing* by such returnes. But you will say then why doe I preface this discourse, with that Expression, *with thankes for the civility of the enquiry in the manner of it's expression?* I say! this will discover the iniquity of this Authour's procedure, in this particular: His enquiry

was; *whether I did not in my Conscience think that there were no true Churches in England, untill the Brownists our Fathers, the Anabaptists our elder brothers, and our selves arose, and gathered new Churches*; without once taking notice, or mentioning his *titles* that he sayes he gave me, I used the words, in a sense obvious to every man's first consideration, as a reproofe of the expressions mentioned; that which was the true cause of my words our *Author* hides in an &c: that which was not by me once taken notice of, is by him expressed; to serve an end of drawing forth an evill surmize and suspition, that hath not the least colour to give it countenance; Passing by all indifferent Readers, I referre the *honesty* of this dealing with me, to the judgment of his owne conscience; setting downe, what I neither *expressed*, nor tooke *notice* of, nor had any *singular* occasion in that place so to doe, the words being often used by him, hiding, and concealing what I did *take notice* of, and expresse, and which to every man's

view was the occasion of that passage, that conclusion or unworthy insinuation is made, which a Good man ought to have abhorred.

Sundry other particulars there are, partly false, and calumniating, partly impertinent, partly consisting in mistakes, that I thought at the first view, to have made mention of, but on several accounts, I am rather willing here to put an end to the Readers trouble, and my owne.

The Pre-

The Preface.

THE *Servants of the Lord* (ſaith *Paul*) *muſt not ſtrive, but be Gentile towards all men*, 2 Tim. 2. 24. how much more towards their Brethren? But what if a Brother, ſhould become an Adverſary (whether *Adverſarius litis*, or *Perſonæ*,) and ſpeak hard words, yea and *write a Booke againſt his* fellow Servants? *Job* telleth us, though *he could*, yet *he would not ſpeak as they* doe, *Job.* 16. 4, 5. And for the book againſt him, He would *take it and bind it upon his ſhoulder*, And yet I doe not think he meant to caſt it behind his Backe, but that he would beare it as a *light loade*, and in caſe

of his Innocency, He would *weare* it as his *Crowne*: And for that end, would declare unto Him *the Number of his steps*, Job. 31.35,36,37? Yea though such a Booke might seeme to Impartiall and Judicious mindes written with a *Spirit of Bitternesse*, and contempt, and in a Style suitable, yet the *Servants of the Lord have not so learned Christ*, nor the Truth (as it is in Jesus) as to Returne *Evill for Evill*, or Reviling for Reviling. Hard words are not Given, but as the Lord commandeth, if not in his Ordinances, yet in his Providence: And either they are *Deserved*, & then they are an excellent Balme which will not break the head: or *undeserved*, and then the Lord will Requite Good to him that suffereth evill. It is no new Thing for God's owne Servants to be taken with *Paroxismes* (as *Paul* and *Barnabas* were, *Act.* 15.) that is, with *Pangs* of Passion, And that is the worst I conceive of the tartest Passages of Mr *Cawdryes* Reply. For I see by his dealing

dealing with Mr *Hooker*, that he *can write with more meekneſſe, and moderation, when the Lord helpeth him:* Let me therefore briefly give Account of ſuch Paſſages of mine, as have ſeemed moſt offenſive to Him: and that in ſuch termes, as may not unbeſeeme either my ſelfe, or the cauſe.

CHAP. I.

THE firſt offence he taketh, is againſt my *Inconſtancy*, and (that which is the fruit of it) my manifeſt and manifold *Contradictions* to my ſelfe to the number of about 21: Inconſtancy in the generall He Intimateth in the Text of *Iames* in his Frontiſpiece, *Iames* 1. 8.

A Double minded man is unſtable in all his wayes.

To which I will *Rejoyne* no other Anſwer than a Text of like Authority, and alleadged (I hope) with more Pertinency, *Math.* 11. 7. *What went*

you out into the wildernesse to see? A Reede shaken with the winde?

The *Contradictions* are set forth in *great letters* in the Title Page and afterwards particularly in an ample *Scheme* in 3 Columnes in the end of his reply, let us consider of them in order.

The 1st Contradiction.

1. *The Keyes were given to Peter as an Apostle, as an Elder, as a Believer. So the Sense is most full. The keyes, Pag. 4.*	1. *The power of the keyes is given to Peter, not as an Apostle nor as Elder, but as a Professt Bel ever The way, P. 27.*	1 Peter *Received not the keyes, meerely as a Believer, but as a Believer publickly professing his Faith, &c. The way cleared.* Part. 2 p. 39. *To like Purpose* M. Hooker Surv. Part. 1. p. 203

The Reconciliation of this Seeming *Contradiction* were obvious and easy; take the words as they stand in the *Scheme*; for so it might be said, *Brethren*, are sometimes put for private members of the Church, and Contradistinguished from such as beare office in the Church. As when it is said in the *Synodicall Letter* (Act.

15. 23.) *The Apoſtles, Elders, and Brethren.* Sometimes Brethren are put more generally, as Comprehending all the members of the Church, both officers and private members as *Gal.* 6. 1: and frequently elſewhere: In the former Sence, the Paſſage in the *Keyes* ſpeaketh, when it ſaith, *the ſenſe of the words will be moſt full, if* Peter *be conceived as Receiving the Keyes in the Name both of the officers, and private members, to wit, in the Name of the Apoſtles, Elders, and Brethren.* In the latter ſenſe, the words of the Scheme might be taken to Runne, That the Power of the keyes was given to *Peter*, not as an Apoſtle (for then it had been Given only to the Apoſtles:) nor as an Elder (for then it had been only to *Elders*) but as a *Profeſt Believer.* And under the Generall Name of *Profeſt Believers*, not only private Brethren, but *Apoſtles*, and *Elders* may be comprehended. For all the Apoſtles & all the *Elders* are profeſt Be-

lievers: And ſo all of them may claime their Intereſt in the Power of the keyes, according to the ſeverall meaſure and latitude of Power aſſigned to them in the Scriptures. But I will not ſo anſwer; becauſe in the *Way* the context ſpeaketh of ſuch Brethren, as have not power to exerciſe the *Paſtoral Miniſtry* of the word & Sacraments. But notwithſtanding that the Aſſoylment of the contradiction is no leſſe faire and cleare. For Mr *Cawdrey* well knoweth (and ſo doth any *Logician:*) That to a contradiction, It is a neceſſary Requiſite (amongſt others:) That both ſpeake *ad Idem.* But here it is otherwiſe. In the *keyes* I ſpake of ſuch a power of the *keyes*, as *Peter* Received Formally, ſtanding in the roome both of an Apoſtle and of an Elder, and of a Proteſt Believer: that is, ſuch a Power as *Peter* having Received might exerciſe in his own perſon, and each one of them reſpectively. In *the Way*, I ſpake of ſuch a power, as the Brethren of the Church have

have Received not formally (farther than concerneth their own liberty) but virtually only.

For though the Brethren have not a *formall Power* to excercise the *Pastorall ministry* of the word and Sacraments, yet they have a *virtuall Power* to exercise them by chooſing and calling forth such Officers as have a *formall Power* to exercise the same. And there is nothing in the *keyes*, or in the *way*, or in the *Defence*, that contradicteth this. So that both these two Passages (in the *keyes*, and in the *way*) are so farre from making a Contradiction (and that so *flat as never any more*) as that they doe not indeed amount to an *Opposition*. In an Opposition both parts cannot be true: here both are true. *Peter* considered as standing in the Roome of an Apostle, Elder, and Profest Believer, did receive Formally all the Power of the keyes: The Body of the Brethren have received, though the power of their liberty Formally;

yet all other Parts of Church Power which belongeth to Officers, they have Received only virtually and this very distinction is expressed *in terminis*, in the very same Page (27. of the way) whence this *Irrision* is fetched. As for his Exageration of the Contradiction, That is was as *flat, as never any more*, though he to make this Comparative Speech seem lesse *hyperbolicall*, doe tell us in a *Parenthesis*, That Contradictions doe not *Recipere magis & minùs* (and therefore if they make any Contradiction at all It must needs be as flat, as ever any was:) He may be pleased to Consider, That such a *Parenthesis*, though it make his Speech, lesse *hyperbolicall*, yet it maketh it the more *irrationall*; If I should say *Nero* was as wicked a man as ever any was, and yet presuppose all men were equally wicked (wickednesse in men did not *Recipere magis & minùs*) there were very little *Reason* in Such Exaggeration.

In my former Answer to this Contra-

tradiction

diction (intituled, *The way of the Congregationall Churches cleared*) I said the words whereon the Assertour grounded this *Contradiction*, were his own not mine. For He reporteth me to say (in the *keyes pag. 4.*) That the keyes were delivered to *Peter as an Apostle, as an Elder, as a Believer.* But in his Preface (*Sect. 5. Num. 1.*) He confesseth;

That the words are not mine *in terminis*: but in sense, (he saith) they be. For I said take *Peter* not as an *Apostle* Only, but as an *Elder* also, and a Believer too, all may well stand together.

Whereupon he Inferreth; *Doth not this discourse clearly hold forth this Proposition, as the sense of that Text, The keyes were delivered to* Peter *as an Apostle, as an Elder, as a Believer too? all may well stand together.*

Ans. That discourse of mine is so farre from *clearly holding forth* that Proposition, that it clearly holdeth forth the contrary in expresse termes:

my

my expresse termes be, *Take* Peter *considered not only as an Apostle &c. now* if *not only* as an Apostle, than not as an Apostle, For if they were delivered to him as an Apostle, then to all the Apostles, and *only* to the Apostles: which my words *in Terminis* doe expresly Deny.

But saith he, *This Apology maketh it worse, For if it be so that whatsoever is Attributed to any as such, is given to all such universally, reciprocally, and only to such:* Now Assume.

But the keyes were given to Peter *as an Apostle, Therefore they were given only to the Apostles, and not to the Believers as such.*

But here the Assumption is *Palpably false*, not at all delivered by me, but dragged out of my words against the letter and against the sence of them. I say the *keyes* were not given to *Peter* as an Apostle only: why then not to him as an Apostle, but as He is joyntly considered with other Officers and Brethren. When therefore

fore he Appealeth to the Judgment of any *Logician*, whether to ſay *Peter* Received *the keyes not as an Apoſtle only, but an Elder alſo, and a Believer, be not as much as to ſay*, Peter *had the Power of the keyes given Him, as an Apoſtle, as an Elder, and as a Believer:* Verily if that were the Judgment of all *Logicians* I ſhould conclude, either that *Logick* had forſaken the world, or at leaſt that my ſelfe were forſaken of *Logick*.

When Chriſt Promiſed the keyes to *Peter*, though he ſpake Indefinitely, keyes, yet he meaneth univerſally all the keyes of the kingdome of Heaven. And to put all the *keyes* into *Peter's* hand as an Apoſtle, though it would communicate them indeed to all the *Apoſtles*, yet ſince the *Death* of all the Apoſtles, all the Churches and all the *Elders*, have been left deſtitute of the Power of the keyes.

And if ſo, then why doe we blame the Seekers who have caſt off all Churches,

ches, and all Ordinances, 'till new Apoſtles come?

Againe the *Replyer* Argueth thus on the contrary (from that Paſſage in the way *pag.* 27:) *If the keyes were given to* Peter, *not as an Apoſtle, nor as an Elder, but as a Believer, then to all Believers, and only to Believers. But (ſaith the* Way) *the keyes were given to* Peter *not as an Apoſtle, nor as an Elder, but as a Believer, therefore they were given to all Believers (Women and all) and only to Believers.*

Anſ. It hath been ſhewed above, That in that Place in *the Way*, I ſpeak expreſly of *Profeſt Believers*, to have received all the power of the keyes not *Formally*, but *virtually*. So that if there be ſome Power of the keyes which they cannot exerciſe *Formally* as Brethren, yet they may exerciſe the ſame *virtually*, by chooſing and calling forth ſuch, as may formally exerciſe the ſame for them: which preſuppoſed I anſwer to the *Major*, If the Power of the keyes (which was to continue

tinue in the Church) were given to *Peter*, not as an Apoſtle, nor as an Elder, but as a Believer, then it was *Given to all Believers*, and only to believers, & to ſuch whom Believers ſhall orderly chooſe, and call forth to execute the ſame. As to inſtance in a like example, If heate be Given to Fire, as ſuch, then to all Fire, and only to Fire, & to ſuch other things, as Fire communicateth his virtue to. When therefore the *Publiſhers* of the *keyes* ſay, *The Power of the keyes may be Diſpoſed in a due Allotment into divers hands*. The Replyer had no cauſe to ſay, *Herein they neither Agree with me, nor with them. They ſay it is put into diverſe hands, And he ſaith it is Given only to Believers: And is not this a Contradiction?*

Anſ: No verily; For when I ſay It is given to Believers as ſuch, and expreſſe *virtually*, as well as *Formally*, The meaning is cleare, It is given to all Believers, and only to Believers, and by them Communicated to ſuch, as they

they doe orderly chooſe and call forth, to the exerciſe of the ſame. And the *publiſhers of the keyes* I doubt not, will ſay as much. When I ſaid (in the way) That the brethren might not adminiſter Sacraments in Deteſt of all Officers, And therefore made it appeare that one ſort of men (the brethren) had not Received all the Power of the keyes Formally. The Replyer returneth, *Truly this is to Diſcover the Contradiction the more. For if the Power of the keyes be Delivered to Believers as ſuch, then the Power of Adminiſtring the Sacraments is Given to them: for that is a Part of the Power of the keyes.*

Anſ. It is wearyſome to repeat ſo often the ſame Anſwer; yet let me ſay it once more, and leave it; He that ſaith, *Believers* Receive all the Power of the keyes as Profeſt Believers, He ſaith all of them have Received the Power, and they only, and ſuch as Receive their Power from them. And this is the force of *quate-*

nus

ans Tale; That whosoever Receive any thing as such, all such doe Receive it, & none but such as *Derive* it from them.

But saith the Replyer, *In the Way, he giveth the greater part of Church power to the Body of the* Church *(pag.* 45. *) to wit,* to Ordaine, and in some cases) to excommunicate *all their Church* Officers: which are the highest Acts of *Rule* (as else where he speaketh:) Therefore he may not *Deny them the lesser, which is to Administer the Sacraments.*

Ans. The answer is ready at hand, and was ready at his hand (in Part 2: of the *Congregationall way cleared* pag. 29.) where I Distinguish *Potestas* into *officiariam* and *honorariam.* Excommunication by the Brethren is the highest Act of *Honoraria Potestas*: but not of *Officiaria Potestas.* To Preach the word with Authority, and to Administer the Seales of it, are acts of the highest office-Power in the Church. Popish Divines would take

it

it very ill, if any Act of Church Power were said to be higher than *Conficere corpus Domini*. But excommunication largly taken is an Act of a Power proper to a Community. Any community hath power *ex Natura rei*, to Receive into their Communion, & to cast out of their Communion. Every sound Body hath a power to cast out his own superfluous humours, and to cut off his own Putrid members: As for *Ordination*, though we looke at it (with Dr *Ames*) as *Adjunctum consummans* of the Peoples Election, and vocation of their Officers (and therefore not utterly Excentrical from the Peoples power;) yet our Churches doe not Practise it ordinarily, where they have Elders of their own, or can Procure other Elders to Joyne with them.

As for that last words in the Scheme of the first Contradiction, I know not whether the *Replyer* put any weight, or stresse, in that, in the first *Columne*, the keyes are said to be given (to wit,

wit, partly) to Believers, and in the same Columne againe to the *Fraternity*, with the *Presbytery*, in the second Columne to Professt Believers, In the third to Believers Publickly Professing their Faith. And (in Mr Hookers Judgment) Not to *Believers* as Believers, but as Believers Covenanting.

But if it be requisite to say any thing to this, I would say. 1. That the *Fraternity*, and *Professt Believers*, and *Believers Publickly Professing* their Faith, are all one. And the common Name of *Believers* is often put for all the rest, They that were *Added to the Church* (Acts 2. 47. and 4. 1.) are called by the common name of Believers *Acts* 2. 44. *and* 4. 32. when Mr *Hooker* saith *the Power is not Given to Believers as Believers*, but as Believers Covenanting, He meaneth the same that I do, by *Professt Believers*.

As for women (whom the Replyer cast in our way before) though they be Believers and so partake in the same common Salvation, as also in the word

and seales: yet because of the frailty of their sex, they are expresly exempted by the Apostle from any Act of Power in the Church. 1 *Cor.* 14. 34, 35. *and* 1 *Tim.* 2. 11, 12. Yet that Impeacheth not the Generality of the Proposition, That all the *Fraternity* of Believers have Part in the Power of the Keyes: *That all men once Dye is* the generall Proposition of the Apostle *Heb.* 9. 27. which is not Impeached by the Translation of *Enoch* and *Elias*.

Having thus cleared the first Answer to this contradiction, Let us weigh next what he saith to the second Answer, which saith he is given to help out the former, for I had said.

2. *If there had been some Difference between the* Keyes *and the* Way, *in some expressions: yet it lay rather in* Logicall Termes, *then in the* Doctrine of Divinity, *or Church Practise, and such is this, about the first subject of the Power of the Keyes.*

What saith the Replyer to this? He Returneth a double exception.

1. Saith He, *Had it been only a lesser*

set Difference about a Logicall Notion (as he minceth it) the Asserter had not Observed it. But a difference (of the highest magnitude) to Contradiction, in Delivering a New way is very Remarkable. How shall we be brought to Agree with them that contradict not only one another, but one man himselfe.

Answer 1. It was not any weakneſſe of the firſt Anſwer, that needed a ſecond to Help it out, but variety of fit matter for a juſt Defence produced it: It needed no help, but to cleare it ſelfe from groundleſſe exceptions.

Answer 2. The ſeeming Difference between the *way* and the *Keyes* (if any be in this point) it lyeth rather in *Logicall expreſſions*, then in the Doctrine of Divinity, or Church Practiſe. For what ever the Different Judgments of men of our way may be, touching the firſt ſubject of the Power of the *Keyes* (ſome Placing it in the Body of the Church, others Dividing it between officers and Brethren) yet in the *Doctrine of Divinity* we all Agree with one Accord, that

the Church (even the Body of Church-members) have power to chooſe their officers, to Admit members, and to cenſure offenders: And that the officers only have Power to Preach the word with office and Authority, and to Adminiſter the Sacraments. And according to this unity of judgment is the uniforme Practiſe of our Churches. And therefore let *mincing* be left to *curious Cookes* to prepare their ſhread meat for queazy ſtomackes: or let it be left to ſuch as would make the beſt of a bad cauſe: we neither *Diſtruſt our Cauſe* to be of God, nor do feare any thing more then that it ſhould be hid, and clouded with prejudices and calumnies from ſuch as know it not, and yet ſeek the Truth in ſincerity. And therefore let the *Replyer* be pleaſed to conſider, whether the Difference be indeed any more then in a *Logicall Notion*: and whether they be the words not only of an *Aſſertour*, but of an *Avenger*, to ſtyle it a *Difference of the higheſt magnitude*? Surely if there were not ſome more then

common

common zeale and Indignation in the cause, A *Contradiction in Logicall Termes*, would not be counted a Difference *of the highest magnitude in Divinity*: nor would such Difference in words so easy to be reconciled, be blowven up to so high an opposition, as *a Contradiction*.

2. His second exception is, *That Howsoever the first Subject is indeed a Logicall Terme, yet the matter Discoursed is Doctrinall Divinity: And whatsoever the Practise be, It is a Contradiction in Divinity as well as in Logick.*

Answer: But I hope it hath appeared, there hath been found no Contradiction at all, neither in Logick nor in Divinity, though there have wanted no *Industry* to search it, nor *animosity* to charge it. And therefore your Question is easily Answered; *How shall we be brought to Agree with them, that Contradict not only one another, but one man himselfe?* For here is yet no Contradiction found of one man to himselfe, nor any Appearance of Contradiction neither in one

man nor other, unleſſe it be only in *Logicall Termes*, and ſcarce therein. But If the *Replyer* deferre his Agreeing with *Divines* or Churches, in any way of Religion, till he meet with ſuch as neither *Contradict themſelves*, nor one another, He muſt neither be Proteſtant nor Puritan (as they have been called) nor of the *Presbyterian*, nor *Congregationall way*.

What if it be ſaid (in the way, pag. 45.) *The brethren of the Church might Proceed (to wit, upon juſt, and weighty grounds) againſt all their officers as well as one? yet in ſuch caſes our Churches are never wont to proceed, but in the Preſence, and with the Conſent and approbation of other Churches?*

Why then ſaith he their Doctrine and Practiſe agree not, which is the greater Blemiſh.

How hard is it for a heart *leavened with Prejudice* to take good things in good part? A free man, *ſui juris* (having his fathers conſent) might marry a wife (if he would) without his Brethrens conſent: And for *Adultery*, he might

might put her away also without their Consent, And yet he will not do either, without their consent, and Approbaion. Is this mans Judgment contrary to his Practise; and is it the greater Blemish? what say we to *Paul*? He Received his *Gospell, neither of man, nor by man.* And he might have Preached it every where boldly and confidently, and have called an *Anathema* upon all such as had gainesayed Him, whether *Angells or Apostles* Gal. 1. 8, 9. yet he chose rather to go up to *Jerusalem* to conferre with the *Apostles* about his whole Gospell *Gal.* 2. 1, 2. and that lest he *had Runne in vaine*, or *should Runne in vaine.* What then? shall we say Then *Pauls Doctrine and Practise Agree not, which is the greater Blemish?* God forbid. Christian Prudence and Religious care to Prevent offence, will condescend to cleare Righteous Proceedings to all judicious and equall mindes. And yet neither crosse his owne judgment of his owne Right, nor blemish (but rather Honour) himselfe by Approving it to others.

3. I gave a third Answer to the former Charge of Contradictions, which he saith, I *Added to succour both the former.*

But the Truth is, they need no succour to Defend themselves against such exceptions: but it is an Honour to truth, to have many witnesses to attend upon it.

I said it for a third Answer, "That it were no just matter of calumny, If in some latter Tractate, I should Retract or expresse more commodiously, what I wrote in a former lesse safely: as *Augustine &c.*

Whereto he Replyeth, Truly Sr, *It had been no just Calumny so to do, but matter of Honour and Reputation rather. But to write Contradictions, and to take no Notice of them, till observed by others: and then to be so farre from Retracting, as to stand upon Justification of them, is nothing like Augustines Practise, and so falleth short of his Reputation.*

Answer: Though *Augustine* Retracted, what he was convinced of, to be erroneous, or unsafe, yet he did not Re-

tract

tract what every one objected against him, (not only what *Faustus, or Petilius or Julian* objected, but not so much as what *Jerome* himselfe objected,) but justly stood upon his owne Defence. Had *Vindex* his objections been Convictions, Reason, and (I hope) conscience, would not have suffered me to Justify knowne Errours. He doth himselfe beare me witnesse, That he hath sometimes heard, I have often *changed my opinions.* And (I thank God) I take it for no shame to change for the better.

But to confesse I am *convinced*, when I am not; and to Retract what a Stranger (though a Brother) conceiveth erroneous, to wit, in his Judgment, but not in mine own, It were as much as to live by another man's Faith, and not mine own: and with all to cast my selfe under that Reproach, which the Title of his Booke implicitly casteth upon me.

A wavering minded man is unstable in all his wayes.

In the conclusiō of his Preface he saith, there are in that Prefatory Epistle to the Way,

and

and in that other to the keyes, other Differences observed, betweene the Author and the Prefacers, but the Author is not pleased to take Notice of them.

It is too hard perhaps to Reconcile others to himselfe.

It is well if he can Reconcile himselfe to himselfe.

Ans. This is the word not of an *Asserter* but of an *avenger*, (whose heart is hot, *Deut.* 19.6.) But Though Mr *Cawdry* know not so much, yet I have taken Notice of those Differences, and have Advertised the Prefacers of the same, whom it concerned. My letters to them are not present at hand with me: If they were I should not think it meet to publish them. In the Preface to the *keyes*, the Prefacers note a Difference between me and them about the *Prophesying of Private Brethren*, concerning which I sent them word, I *Discerned* no Dissent at all between them and me in that Point, though they had Added a case or two of liberty, more than there they did expresse.

Whether

Whether it be too *hard* for me or no to Reconcile others with my selfe it is enough, that I *keep the unity of the Spirit with them in the bond of Peace:* and that I have learned *Placide ferre contra Sentientes.*

But howsoever I hope (by the help of Christ) I shall soone *Reconcile my selfe to my selfe*, unlesse the Replyer can prevaile with me so farre, as to make me not only to *fall out* with my selfe, but to *fall off* from the Truth too, or else convince me that I have so fallen, and yet even so I hope the Lord will help me rather to Reconcile my selfe to the Truth, than my selfe to my selfe.

CHAP. 2.

Touching the second Pretended contradiction, with the 3, 4, 5.

The second Contradiction which the Replyer chargeth is delineated in the Scheme thus.

2. *The keyes are Given to the Church of Believers*, The way pag. 1. that is a combination, of Faithfull men, as Mr. Hooker.	2. *The key of knowledg belongeth to all the faithfull, whether Joyned to any particular Church or no.* The Keyes pag. 11.	2. *The key of knowledge is given not only to the Church, but to some before they enter into the Church,* Keyes pag. 2.

Ans. This terme the *key of knowledge* is taken from our Saviour's words, in *Luk.* 11. 52. Where he Reproveth the Lawyers, who had taken away the *key of knowledge*, and neither entred in themselves, nor suffered others to enter. The words argue, that the *entring in* was not into the visible Church: for into that the *Lawyers* had entred, and were willing to admit others. He speaketh therefore of *entring into the state of Grace*, and so into the kingdome of Grace and Glory. The solution then is plaine and easy, The key of knowledge (or Faith) belongeth to all the faithfull, whether Joyned to any particular Church or no. For by it they enter into the Kingdome of Grace and Glory. But if we speak of

of the keyes of a Particular visible Church, they are all given to the Church or Congregation of Believers.

Touching the third Contradiction.

The third Contradiction is decyphered thus.

3. *The key of Order is Common to all the members of the Church: keyes pag. 8. Then say we, to Women and Children.*	3 *It is not every place, or Order in the Church, that giveth Power to Receive Ordinances, much lesse to Dispense them, as Children and Women.* Way cleared part. 2. pag. 19.

Ans. 1. It hath been Answered above, that *such Generall Propositions* hold true, notwithstanding some knowne *particular exceptions*. It is appointed to all men once to Dye: which is an undoubted Truth, though *Enoch* and *Elias* never Dyed.

Ans. 2. The Children of Church-members are in *Order* to Baptisme, but excluded from the Lord's Table. 1 *Cor.* 11. 28.

Women have some *parts of the key* of Order

Order, whereby they have power to walke *Orderly* themselves, and in a private way to help others to walk Orderly also, *Act.* 18.26.*Tit.*2.3,4,5.

Only they have not *Power to* Admit members, choose Officers, censure Offenders. But if they have any part of the *power of the keyes*, the Proposition is true, yea and it were true also, though they had been kept from all Interest in the Exercise of the keyes.

Touching the fourth Contradiction. The fourth Contradiction is thus laid out.

4. *Ordination is a work of Rule.* The way, pag. 49. *Ordination and Jurisdiction (both Acts of Rule) pertaine indifferently to all the Presbyters.* ibid. pag. 49.	4. *As for Election, & Ordination of Officers these things the brethren may doe (if need be) without Officers* The way, pag. 45.101.	4. *Ordination is not an Act of Supreme Jurisdiction, but of Order rather,* Hooker's Survey part. 2.75.

Ans. Ordination, They that make the least of it make it an *Act of Prayer*, & such Prayer, by which the lesse is blessed of the

the greater; as it is in all Prayer which is Joyned with Imposition of hands; which Argueth, it is an Act of *majority* of Power: and majority of Power may without a *Solœcisme* be called, *Rule*: though not office-Rule, yet Honourable preheminence. I no where call it an *Act of Supreme Jurisdiction* which is that Mr *Hooker* Denies; and seemeth to Deny it, not *Positively* neither, but *comparatively* rather. *Ordination* (saith he) *is not an Act of Supreme Jurisdiction, but of Order rather*, then there is no contradiction here. Nor will it be found in the other *clause*, for though Ordination and Jurisdiction be said (in the *Way* pag. 49.) to pertaine indifferently to all the Presbyters: yet that is expressly spoken in opposition to the *Lord Bishops*, who usurped both into their own hands, as their peculiar prerogative: and though I say, (elsewhere in the *Way*) that in Election & Ordination of Officers, the Brethren may act (if need be) without Officers: yet the very word of limitation (if need be) Argueth

eth, that in *ordinary cases*, ordination pertaineth to the *Presbyters*, as other Acts there mentioned doe pertaine to the Presbyters, and Brethren met together: but as for *Election*, I take it to pertaine principally to the Brethren.

Touching the 5th Contradiction.

The 5th Contradiction followeth in this sort.

5 The Keye of Authority, or Rule is committed to the Elders of the Church, and so the Act of Rule is the proper Act of their office, Keyes pag. 20.

The People discerning, and approving the Justice of the censure give consent and Obedience to the will and Rule of Christ, keyes pag. 35. 37. 41.

The People stand in an Order, even as orderly Subjection according to the Order of the Gospel, pag. 11.

5. In case the Officers doe Erre and give offence they shall be governed by the whole Body of the Brethren, The Way Pag. 100.

The Church exerciseth severall Acts of Authority over the Elders, The Way, pag. 101.

The People have some sticke of Power and Authority in the Government of the Church, pag. 36.

They Rule the Church by Appointing their own officers, ibid. pag. 16.

Anſ. 1. The former Columne in all the three Places speaketh of *Elders* walking in the right Administration of their office:

office then in Propriety of ſpeech the *Key* of Authority and Rule is committed to them 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. and is there made the proper Act of their office, Then it is that the People Diſcerning the will and Judgment of Chriſt in their Judgment, they do give *Conſent* and *Obedience* to the will of Chriſt in Cenſures Adviſed by them, Then it is alſo that they walke in orderly ſubjection to their Elders, *Heb.* 13. 17.

But the latter Columne ſpeaketh of the Power of the Church over the Elders chiefly in caſe of the Elders *mal-Adminiſtration* of their office, or miſgovernment of themſelves. But then the Power which the Church putteth forth, It is not office Power (which is properly Authority:) but *Poteſtas honoraria.*

Anſwer 2. In Columne the ſecond when it is ſaid; The People have ſome *ſtock of Power* and Authority in the Government of the Church, *Keyes* pag. 36. They are the words of an objection, not of mine owne Aſſertion, And though

some where I speak of Acts of Authority over the Elders, I do clearely explaine my selfe in the *Keyes* (pag. 36.) That Authority is taken in a large sense, and after a sort, when it is Acknowledged, in the People over the Elders, As

1. When a man acteth according to his owne will freely, he is then said to be αὐτεξούσιος, *Dominus sui Actus*, so the People in all the Acts of liberty, which they put forth, they are *Domini sui Actus*, Lords of their owne Actions.

2. The people by sundry Acts of liberty, (as in Election of officers, in sending forth their messengers, in concurrence with their Elders, in the Admission of members, and censure of Offenders, in the Determination and Promulgation of Synodall Acts) They have a great *stroke* and Power in the Ordering of Church Affaires: which may be called ἐξουσία, or *Potestas*, a Power which many times (in Common speech) goeth under the Name of Rule or Authority. But in proper speech, It is indeed a *Priviledge*, or liberty, an ἐξουσία,

or

or Power rather then Authority. It is a common speech usuall amongst our best Divines, That the Government of the Church is mixt of a *Monarchy*, an *Aristocracy*, and a *Democracy*. In regard of Christ the Head, the Government of the Church is Soveraigne and *Monarchicall*. In regard of the Rule by the Presbytery it is *Stewardly* and *Aristocraticall*: In Regard of the Peoples Power in Elections, and censures, It is *Democraticall*.

Chap. 3. Touching the sixth Contradiction.

The sixth Contradiction is thus Presented.

6. Examination is one of the highest Acts of Rule: and therefore cannot be performed, but by some Rulers. Keyes pag. 16.

The Church cannot Excommunicate the whole Presbytery, because they have not received from Christ an office of Rule without

6. If all their officers were found Culpable either in Heretical Doctrine, Or in scandalous Crimes, the Church hath full Authority to proceed against them all. The Way, pag. 45.

In case of offence given by an Elder, or the whole Elder-

6. Excommunication is not an Act of the Power of office, but of judgment, Nor an Act of highest Rule but of supreame Judgment vested in the Fraternity. Surv. part. 3. pag. 45.

As a Church of

without their Officers, Ibid.

No Act of the Peoples power doth properly bind unlesse the Authority of the Presbytery Joyne with it. Ibid. pag. 36.

ship together, the Church hath Authority to require satisfaction, and if they give it not, to Proceed to Censure Ibid. page 101.

of Brethren can not proceed to any publick Censure without the Elders so nor the Elders without concurrence of the People, Preface to the *Keyes* pag. 4.

Answer 1. Here is indeede a Discrepance in Expressions between the *Way*, and the *Keyes*. But it was not my Act, that any such Discrepance should have been extant. The truth is, That many yeares agoe, (and some yeares before the suppressing of the Bishops in England) I was *seriously* moved by some of our Brethren, and fellow Elders here, to Draw up an *Historicall* Narration of our *Church-way* together with some familiar grounds of the same briefly. In short time as God Helped, I dispatched it, which when our brethren had perused, I saw they did not close with it. Yet a Brother going for England, got some where a Copy of it, and Presented it to some of the *Congregationall* way there

and

and I afterwards heard, that neither did they cloſe with it: and in particular not with that Paſſage, which is here recited, as a part of the Contradiction. Which ſince appeareth more openly, by the *Aſterisk* put upon that Paſſage, and upon ſundry other in the Book: But before I ſaw that, and had only heard, That they did not fully Accord, I hoped it had met with a timely ſuppreſſion, rather then an impreſſion: for I heard no more of it, for two, or three yeares after: Meane while perceiving That one maine Point of Diſſatisfaction, was the Authority given to the Fraternity, I conſidered more ſeriouſly and Diſtinctly, of the whole Power of the *Keyes*, and expreſſed my Apprehenſions in that Treatiſe of the Keyes, which our brethren here did well Accept, and ſo did the brethren (of like Judgment) in England, and ſome of them were pleaſed to Atteſt it with the Preface which is now extant before it: yea I have heard (as well as ſome other of our Brethren here) by ſome letters from England, that

Reverend Mr *Rutherford* (who was a great Part of the Assembly at Westminster) offered to the Dissenting brethren, That if they would come up to the Treatise of the Keyes, themselves would meet them there. But this was sundry yeares, after the Treatise of the *way* had been finished, and carried to England, and (as I hoped) suppressed. But it seemeth some Brother there, having got a Copy of it, being zealous of the Authority of the *Fraternity*, and Perceiving that their Authority was not so fully Acknowledged in the *Keyes* as in the *Way*, He caused his Copy of the *Way* (which was indeed abrupt in the entrance, and imperfect otherwise) to be Published in Print: which when I saw, It troubled me not a little, as knowing, That the Discrepant Expressions in the one, and in the other, might trouble friends, and give Advantage to Adversaries. Afterwards Mr *Hooker* coming downe from *Connecticquot*, to consult with the Elders here about his Book, He pleaded seriously for the Placing of

all

all Church power, primitively, in the Body of the Church, and also for their Judiciary Power of Censure over the Presbytery, suitable to what I had delivered in the *Way*; Now, though I cannot say, that his Reasons did prevaile with me, to Iter the Placing of the *First Subject* of the *Power of the Keyes*, from what I had delivered in the Treatise of the *Keyes*: yet Perceiving that some mens Judgments did more Adhere as to his Judgment, so to the former course of the *Way*: others to that of the *Keyes*, I suffered both to stand as they did, especially seeing I could not help it, the Book of the *Way* being published without my Consent; and both the *Way*, and the *Keyes* being dispersit into many hands (past my Revoking) and Refuted by some; So that if the Replyer find some *Discrepancy* in one of these bookes from the other, Let him know that the Doctrine of the *Way* (in such few Points wherein it differeth from the *Keyes*) was not then mine when the *Keyes* were published, much lesse when the *Way* was

publiſhed, which was many yeares after, though it had been penned many yeares before. And yet take all the Diſcrepancyes, and weigh them (I will not ſay with Candour but with Rigour) and I do not yet remember, nor can I yet find any of them, but they lye rather in Difference of *Logicall Notion*, then in *Doctrine of Divinity*, or Church Practiſe, as I ſaid before.

Anſwer 2. This further; let me Acquaint both the Replyer, and the Reader withall, that ſometimes there hath growne a Queſtion, amongſt us whether all Excommunication be an Act of *Officiaria Poteſtas*, or not ſome *Honoraria* only? If of *Officiaria*, It cannot be Diſpenſed by the Brethren only, as the firſt Columne hath it. If of *Honoraria*, It may, and ſo the ſecond Columne hath it: and then the Contradiction is not *ejuſdem*.

Neither is this Cenſure diſpenſed by the brethren (as I conceive) one of the higheſt Acts of Rule (which is to deliver unto Satan 1 *Cor.* 5. 5.) but Reacheth

eth only to caſt their Elders, out of Adminiſtration of office to them, and out of Church Communion with them. The Truth is, *Ego libenter in eorum me numero eſſe Profiteor, qui proficiendo Scribunt, & Scribendo proficiunt*, which gave me occaſion to Adde the third Anſwer given above to the firſt Contradiction, Some things in the way which I delivered more laxly, I expreſſe more diſtinctly in the Treatiſe of the *Keyes* which followed after: and ſome things more fully and clearely, in the way cleared, then in either of the former.

Anſwer 3. When I ſay No Act of the *Peoples* part, doeth properly binde, unleſſe the Authority of the *Elder* joyne with it (*Keyes* pag. 36.) I would be underſtood to ſpeak it as I meant it, of the Elders walking without offence, in the Right Adminiſtration of their office, and Converſation of their lives.

Anſwer 4. When Mr *Hooker* ſaith. Excommunication is not an Act of *Office*, *Power*, nor of Rule, but of ſupreame *Judgment* ſeated in the *Fraterni-*

ty,

1), I easily grant that the Excommunication dispensed by the *Fraternity* is not an Act of *Office-Power*; But it may Justly be Inquired, whether Excommunication, being Dispensed by the Elders with the consent of the Church, be not an Act, as of the Churches honourable Judiciall Power, so of the Elders Office-Power, and Rule in the Church? For as the Pastorall Preaching of the Elders is *Officiall*, and so *Authoritative*, though the Preaching of other Brethren (as of the Sonnes of the Prophets) be not so: so why may there not be the like Difference, observed here? To deliver unto Satan seemeth to be an Act of *Judiciall Office-Power*, as when in another case it is said, *The Judge delivereth a man to the Officer, and the officer casteth him into Prison* Matth. 5. 25. He that *casteth into Prison* is an Inferiour officer. The Judge must therefore be a Superiour officer, that delivereth an offendour to the officer, to be cast into Prison. In the Excommunication of the *Incestuous Corinthian* (where both the Elders and Brethren

Brethren concurred) the sentence might well be delivered in Termes that expresse an Act of highest Authority, To *deliver unto Satan*. But where the Church is called to Act against their *Elders* (who corrupt them with false Doctrine) there the Apostle Requireth the Church, to *mark them, and Avoyd them*, Rom. 16. 17, 18. which may expresse an Act of liberty, and *Judiciall Power*, but not of Authority.

CHAP. 4.

Touching the seaventh, Contradiction and eighth.

The seaventh Contradiction is thus gathered.

7. It was a Sacrilegious Breach of Order, That Commissaries and Chancellours wanting the Key of Order (as Ministers) have been invested with Jurisdiction. Yea and more then Ministeriall Authority, above those Elders, who labour in word and Doctrine. The Keyes pag. 16.

7. There is a Key of Power given to the Church (with the Elders) as to open a doore of entrance to the Ministers calling, so to shut the doore of entrance against them in some cases &c. The Keyes p. 9. Yea to Censure all their Elders (without Elders) The Way p. 45. as before.

Answ.

Anſ. The power given to the *Commiſſaries Chancellors* &c: I juſtly called a *Sacrlegious Breach of Order* in more Reſpects than one.

1. In that being no *Miniſters*, they exerciſed more *than Miniſteriall Authority* over the Elders. For Miniſters doe not exerciſe Authority over Elders, no nor over any Brother, but with conſent of the Church. But theſe doe it without, and againſt the Conſent of the Church.

2. In that they exerciſe this Authority even in Churches wherein they have not Received the *key of Order*, and ſo ſtand not ſo much as in the Order of Members amngſt them.

3. In that they proceed againſt them, not for crimes committed againſt the word of God, but for Neglect of Popiſh Canons or Humane Traditions.

But now no Authority allowed to *Brethren* either in the *Keyes* or in the *Way*, cometh neere to this Breach of Order.

For 1. In *Joyning* with the Elders

to

to open a doore of entrance to *Miniſter's* calling, They put forth no Act of *Authority* (properly ſo called) at all: but only exerciſe a *liberty* and Power orderly which they have Received from the Lord Jeſus, to elect their own officers, As the Peoples election of *Deacons* (Act. 6. 2. to 5th.) And their lifting up of hands in the choice of Elders (*Act.* 14. 23.) doth declare. And when they doe *ſhut them forth* it is not without their *Elders*, where their *Elders* are not wanting, or not wanting to their Duty. And even then, they put forth no Act of *Office* Rule, or Authority (properly ſo called) as the *Commiſſaries* doe, but only an Act of Judiciall Power common to the whole Church, 1 *Cor.*5.12.

2. The People do exerciſe this Power only in their own Church where themſelves are members, and have Received *a key of Order.*

3. They proceed not againſt any, much leſſe againſt their Elders, but for notorious offences, committed againſt the

the word of God, in Doctrine or life, so that this Contradiction speaketh as little *ad idem* as any of the former.

Touching the 8th Contradiction.

The 8th Contradiction is represented thus.

8. *We are so farre from Allowing the Sacrilegious usurpation of the Ministers office, That private Christians ordinarily take upon them to Preach the Gospell Publickly*; The Keyes, pag 6.	8. *This is ordinarily Practised in England, and Allowed by the Independant Brethren. Yea they being but in the Notion of Gifted Brethren, no Ministers to other Congregations, doe it ordinarily themselves.*

Anſ. 1. This Contradiction is not of *me* to my *ſelfe*, but of ſome others, who whether they be *Independants* truly ſo called, I doe not know: ſure I am, that Presbyterians and Independants are not *membra Dividentia*, though I ſee, that all that are not for *Popery*, or Epiſcopacy, or Presbytery, doe commonly lurke under the ſtyle of *Independancy*. I hope the Replyer would be loth to Renounce the Proteſtant Religion, becauſe there

there are found some contradictions, and greater than these, in one of them to another.

Ans. 2. When I call it a Sacrilegious usurpation for *Private Christians Ordinarily* to take upon them to Preach the Gospell Publickly, & to Administer the Sacraments; yet this *latter of Administring the Sacraments the Replyer leaveth out*, and so the Contradiction is not *ad idem*: which is a Common failing in this, and the rest. For I would not say that it is a Sacrilegious usurpation, for well gifted Brethren (where ordained Ministers cannot be had) there to Preach ordinarily and Publickly, especially if they be Approved by those that have Power, and requested thereto by the People, wherein I goe further in giving way to the Prophecying of Private Brethren, than my Reverend Brethren (the Prefacers to the *Keyes*) doe, who only Allow them to *Preach occasionally*, and not ordinarily, which I speak only to this end, That the Replyer and others may know, there is more

consent

consent and Agreement in our Judgments, then they take notice of, or sometimes our selves either. But if Private Brethren doe *Administer the Sacraments* at all whether ordinarily, or Occasionally, It seemeth to me like the Fact of *Uzziah* in offering Incense.

CHAP. 5.

Touching the 9th Contradiction.

The 9th Contradiction is layd out thus.

9. *A Particular Church of Saints Professing the Faith (that is members without office) is the first subject of all the Church-Officer, with all their Spiritual Gifts & Power, Keys.* pag. 31.

9. *As the keyes of the kingdome of Heaven are divers, so are the Subjects to whom they are committed diverse*, keyes pag. 11. *The Apostles were the first subject of Apostolicall power.* ibid. pag. 32. *And is the first Subject of that Power whereby Errour is convinced, and condemned.* ibid. pag. 47.

9. *The Power of the keyes belongeth firstly to a Congregation of Covenanting Believers*, Surv. part. 2. 219. *The Power of the keyes is in the Church of Believers, as in the first subject.* ib. p. 155 *This concrete is wide in it self one first subject of this power, & yet others to share in this power, not by means of this, for this is to speak contradictions.* ibid.

Ans. 1.

Anſ. 1. This is one of thoſe Differences, of which I ſpake before, that lyeth rather in *Logicall Notion*, than either in *Doctrine of Divinity*, or in Church Practiſe. Againſt which the exception made above, hath been Anſwered above, in clearing the firſt Contradiction.

Anſ. 2. There is no *colour of Contradiction* betweene the two former *Columnes*. For when I ſay A Particular Church is the *firſt Subject* of all the Church Officers and their Gifts, I ſpeak not of this or that particular Church, (which is but an *Individuall*) but of a Particular Church taken *Indefinitely*, which (by meere errour of the Printer) is without ſence ſaid, taken *Independently*, which is the Diſadvantage of us, who live ſo far remote from the Preſſe, that we can neither prevent their miſtakes nor correct them afterwards. But take a Particular Church *Indefinitely* & it comprehendeth all *Particular Churches:* And that God hath given to Particular Churches all ſpirituall officers together

with their Gifts, for the Diſcharge of their offices, is Proved by evident Texts of Scripture, in that very Page of the *Keyes* 31. I doe not ſay (as ſome doe) that the *Church* meaning the *Fraternity* is the *firſt ſubject* of all ſpirituall Gifts (for then they had received them *immediately* without officers:) but I ſay the offices and Officers, not devoid of Gifts, but furniſhed with their gifts, are given by Chriſt to the *Church freely*, and not to any other Perſon or Society, from whom the Church Receiveth them.

But this no whit croſſeth, what is ſaid in the ſecond *Columne*, That *Elders* are the *firſt Subjects* of ordinary Miniſteriall Power, and Apoſtles of *Apoſtolicall Power*, and Synods, of *Synodicall* Power. A wife may be the firſt ſubject of her *own Dowry*, but yet her Husband is the firſt Subject *Recipient* of his wife with her Dowry.

Anſ. 3. As for what is ſaid differently by my *Brother Hooker* in the third Columne, as his Perſon and Gifts and Freind-

Friendſhip were pretious and deare to me whileſt he lived: ſo now that he reſteth in Glory, his Name and memory, and labour (ſaviug ſome very few private Notions) are honourable, and bleſſed, with me, and I ſuppoſe with all that knew him. But in this *Logicall Notion*, I crave leave, not ſo much to diſſent from him (for he herein Diſſented from me, who wrote firſt, rather than I from him) but leave I crave not to Retract what I formerly wrote in the *Keyes* touching this Point, though I ſhould as much ſuſpect mine own judgment, where he Diſſenteth from me, as where any man. It is true he taketh the Church of Covenanted Believers to be the firſt Subject of the power of the keyes, vvhich if he meane no more, than that they have all Church-Power either *formaliter*, or *Radicaliter*, and *Virtualiter*, then there is no Difference in our expreſſions, but if he meane that that they are the firſt Subject of all Church-Povver properly, two or three things Detaine me from conſen-

ting with him herein. 1. That vvhich is the first Subject of any Povver Receiveth it immediately vvithout any other Intervening Subject. As *fire* being the first *Subject* of Heate, Receiveth not his Heate from any former Subject. But it is evident, That many a Church of Believers, hath not Received *Pastorall Gifts*, nor it may be any Gifts fit for office, 'till they fetch them from other Churches, and sometimes from some who are not members of any Particular Church at all.

2. The first Subject of any Power, as it hath immediately Received it: so it may immediately exercise it: as Fire (the first subject of Heate) can Heate without Intervention of any other subject.

But the Church hath not Power immediately to exercise *Pastorall Preaching*, or Administration of the Sacraments, 'till it have procured and chosen, and called forth some or other Gifted Persons to exercise the same.

3. I might Adde a third Reason to both

both the former. Whatſoever is properly the *firſt Subject* of any Power, It hath that ſame Power, or ſome other equivalent, and *analogicall* to it, not only *radicaliter* and *virtualiter*, but *Formaliter* alſo. And becauſe *formaliter*, therefore *radicaliter* and *virtualiter*. For whatſoever is in any Subject Firſtly, (whether it be proper Adjunct, or proper effect, or any other proper Argument) it either floweth from the *forme*, or from the *matter* ſo formed; As for inſtance, capacity of Learning, or *Riſibility* is in Man, as in the firſt ſubject. The former floweth from the *Reaſonable* ſoule: the latter from the *matter* of a man ſo formed. But neither of theſe are in man *radicaliter* or *virtualiter*, but only becauſe they are in a man *formally*, and ſo either flow from the *forme*, or from the *matter* ſo formed. Take another Inſtance, and of another ſort. The People that have power to *elect a King*, though they have not *formally* kingly power, yet have they a *formall Power*, to ſubmit

themſelves to Kingly Power. And ſo haveing a formall Power to put one of the Relatives, they have an æquivalent and *Analogicall* Power to put the other Correlative. For, *Poſito uno Relatorum, Ponitur etiam & alterum.*

As for that which is quoted by the Replyer from Mr *Hooker*, in the laſt clauſe of the third Columne of this contradiction, I ſee not how it concerneth me, or contradicteth any thing in the former Columnes. For I doe not make any firſt Subject of Church-Power, and yet others to ſhare in that Power, but not by meanes of that. But as the *keyes of the kingdome of heaven* are diverſe: So I ſee no Inconvenience, that the firſt Subjects to whom the ſeverall keyes are committed, may be diverſe alſo. Neither doth the letter of the Text ſeeme to me to gaineſay that, *Mat.* 16.18. For though it ſpeak, not to *Them* but to *Thee*; a Repreſenting one ſtate or Condition of men: yet ſay that one condition to be believers and take Believers in a large ſence, It comprehen-

deth

deth all ſorts of Profeſſing Believers; whether Private membets, or Elders, or Apoſtles, indeed all. But neither doe I ſee any convincing reaſon ſeeing *Peter* ſtood in a threefold Eccleſiaſticall Relation (being both an Apoſtle, and an Elder, & a Profeſt Believer) why Chriſt committing the keyes to him (ſaying to Thee will I give them) might not Intend to give all the keyes; and the ſeverall ſorts of them, according to the ſeverall Relations he ſtood in.

If it be ſaid All that ſhare in the ſubject to whom the keyes are Given (in theſe words, *To Thee*) they all ſhare alike in the ſame *equall Power* of the keyes, becauſe they have all the ſame Commiſſion: I Anſwer it would indeed ſo follow, If there were no other *ſeverall Commiſſions*, granted in Scripture elſe where, but only here; But cleare it is from other Scriptures, That Power of *Authoritative Preaching*, and Adminiſtering the Sacraments, is Given only to Apoſtles, Elders, and ſuch like officers: but Pow-

er of Priviledge and Judgment, is given all the Fraternity.

CHAP. 6.

Touching the 10th Contradiction with the 11th 12th 13th.

The 10th Contradiction is thus held forth.

10. *Pastour and Flocke are Relatives, and so he is a Pastour to none but his owne Congregation.* This is the Common Tenent.	10. *The members of any Church we Admit to the Lords Table (if they bring testers testimoniall.) and their Children to Baptisme.* The *Way* p. 68. The *Keyes*, p. 17.	10. *Administration of Sacraments is a Ministeriall Act: and what Authority hath a Pastour to do it, or they to Receive it from him to whom he is no Pastour?* Mr. *Hooker* Surv. Part. 2. 64, 65. *Pastours and Teachers might Pray and Preach in other Churches besides their owne: but not Administer Seales and Censures.* Bartlets *Medull* pag. 63.

Answer 1. That Appearance of Contradiction is easily Removed, if our Doctrine and *Practise* be knowne, as it is, what a *Pastour* doeth in his owne Congregation, and to his owne Flock, he doeth it by *Pastorall Power*, and Authority,

thority, what he doth to the members of other Churches, abroad, or out of his own Congregation, He doeth it not *Authoritativè*, but *Precariò*, and not in a constant, but in a transient way: which the communion of Churches doth not only Admit, but readily (as occasion serveth) Desire. What Mr *Hooker* doubted of in this Point, he Answereth himselfe in the end of the same *Pag.* 65.

If *Paul*, *Apollos*, and *Cephas*, things present and things to come, be all Given to the Particular Church of Corinth (1 *Cor.* 3. 22.) who yet had no peculiar Interest in them more then other Churches. By the same Right all the officers, and all their Gifts are theirs also, in the same way. Theirs they are not κτ' κρῖσιν. (for each Church hath his peculiar offices, as their owne propriety): Then they are theirs κτ' χρῆσιν, for their use, not Authoritatively, nor Ordinarily, but occasionally, as God giveth opportunity; Ordinarily as the *Officers* must attend to their owne *Flock*, so must the *Flock* Depend upon their owne

owne *Officers*. The officers have no Authority over any Flock, but that which the Holy Ghost hath committed to them: Neither can any other Flock command the employment of any of their Gifts, or any act of their office amongst them. But upon occasion, in a transient way, as they may have need of their Gifts, so they may have need of some Act of their Office, and accordingly may Desire it, and Receive it.

The 11th Contradiction which is thus set forth.

11. *We Receive the Sacrament of the Lords Supper (say the same of Baptisme) as a Seale of Communion, not only with the Lord Jesus in our owne Churches but in all the Churches of the Saints,* Keyes pag. 17. Del. of 9. Posit pag. 133, 134.

11. *Baptisme (and so the other Sacrament) sealeth up the External Communion with a Particular Church &c.* Mr H. Surv. Part. 3. pag. 27.

And he disputes against it, as to the Catholick Church.

Answer: When we say, that the *Sacraments are Seales of Communion with the Lord Jesus not only in our owne Church, but in all the Churches of the Saints,*

Saints, we do not meane that they ſeale up the ſame meaſure of Externall Communion with other Churches, as with our owne. They do not ſeale up this Communion, That their officers are our officers, and we their Flock: Or that we have the ſame Power over them, which we have over our owne members. This were to ſeale up not a Communion but a Confuſion of Churches; And this is that which Mr *Hooker* in the place alledged doeth deny as our ſelves alſo do.

The 12th Contradiction is thus declared.

12. *It is an Act of the Elders Power and Authority to Examine whether Officers, or members, before they be Received of the Church*, Keyes pag 21.

12. *As for Admiſſion, Election, Ordination of Officers, Admiſſion or ſhutting out of Members, theſe things the Brethren may do without officers*, The *Way* p. 45. 101

Anſwer: The Anſwer is Obvious, what the Elders do in this kind, *Ex Officio*, The Church may do the like in the want of Elders.

The

The 13th Contradiction is set before us thus.

13. *Ordination is then Compleat when the People hath Chosen an Officer, and the Presbytery hath laied their Hands on him*, Keyes p. 37.	13. *But if the Church want a Presbytery, for want of Elders they want a warrant to Repaire to the Presbytery of another Church to Impose hands upon their Elect Elders*, Way, p. 90.

Answer: In that Place of the *Keyes*, I only Assert and Prove, That a man of *Sufficient Gifts* chosen by the People of the Church, and Ordained by the Presbytery of his owne Church, wanteth nothing to the compleat Integrity of his calling. The *Right hand of Fellowship* given by the Elders of other Churches expresseth their Approbation of his calling, but addeth nothing to the essence, or Integrity of his calling.

But when I say that in want of a Presbytery of their owne, they want a warrant to Repaire to the Presbytery of another Church for his Ordination, I no where say, That the *Officer Elected*,

Elected, wanteth the complete Integrity of his calling, for want of the Imposition of hand, of the *Presbytery* of another Church. And yet that had been requisite to make up a pretence of a Contradiction. The Replyer knoweth that a Church wanting a *Presbytery* of their owne to lay hands upon an Elect Officer in our Judgment, they may appoint some of the *Elders* and graver Members of their owne Body, to supply the Defect of their owne *Presbytery*; which we Account sufficient to the completing of his calling in such a case.

But when I said (in the *Way*) That the Church wanting a *Presbytery*, they wanted a warrant to Repaire to the Presbytery of another Church to *Impose hands* upon their Elect Elders, I meant in way of Subordination to an Extrinsecall Power. For it is against that which both the Reasons Plead, which I there Alleadged for that Purpose. But I no where dislike, That a Church wanting a Presbytery of their owne may send

send for Elders of other Churches, to Assist them, and to Joyne with them in the Ordination of their Elect Officers.

CHAP. 7.

Touching the 14th Contradiction with 15. and 16.

The 14th Contradiction is thus laied out.

14. *Paul and Barnabas were Ordained to that Office (of Apostleship) by the Imposition of hands of some officers or Members of the Church, Way, p. 45.*	14. *In Act. 13. 2, 3. There is no Ordination to Office at all: for the Apostles had their office before Mr. Hooker, Surv. Part. 2. p. 83. This was not to put a new office upon them, but to confirme their sending to the Gentiles ib. p. 60.*	14. *This was done in a Particular Church Keyes, p. 29. The officers of one Church did what was done in an ordinary Way, Surv. Part. 2. p. 83. Then it follow-*

eth (by Mr. C.) his Doctrine that the Apostles who were officers in all Churches were ordained in a Particular Church: or that officers of a Church may be ordained in another Church: which he said was unwarrantable.

Ans. 1. When I say (in the *Way*) That *Paul* and *Barnabas*, were ordained to

to the *Apoſtolick* office by Impoſition of hands of ſome officers of the Church at *Antioch* (Act. 13. 1, 2, 3.) It is not Diſproved (by Mr *Hooker*) ſaying that they had had their office before. For I noe where ſay, That ordination Giveth the office, but only Approveth it and Solemnely, (as it were) Inſtalleth the elect officer into it, and ſendeth him forth with a Bleſſing into the Adminiſtration of it. Neither when he ſaith, That there is there no Ordination unto office at all, doth he contradict what I affirme, For his meaning is, to Deny it in Mr *Rutherford's* ſence, who ſpeaketh there of Ordination, as *Giving the calling* unto the office: which Mr *Hooker* Diſproveth, and therein I concurre with him. For it puts no New office upon them, but Bare witneſſe to that calling, which the Holy Ghoſt had given them.

When Mr *Hooker* ſaith, The Officers of one Church did what was done in an ordinary way, He himſelfe inferreth the conſequence, *Therefore it is no Precedent for the Paſtors of many Churches, what*

what either they may or ſhould doe.

But the Inferences which Mr *Cawdry* gathereth, as from my Doctrine out of that Text, either will not hold, or not hurt our cauſe. For this Inference will not hold, *That then the Officers of one Church may be ordained in another.*

For they were as much Officers of the Church of *Antioch*, as of any other Churches, It will only inferre, That they who are officers in many Churches, may be *Ordained* in any one of them.

The other inference will in part follow That ſome of the Apoſtles (who were Officers in all Churches) may be *Ordained* in a Particular Church, when the Holy Ghoſt calleth for it. For they Act now not in their own Name, or Power, but in the great Name, and Soveraigne Power of the Lord *Jeſus*, who is the Head of all Churhes.

But what Prejudice is that to our cauſe? or wherein doth it contradict any of our Tenents?

The

The 15th Contradiction is thus Declared.

14. *What if the whole Presbytery offend? The readiest course is to bring the matter to a Synod, the Keyes pag. 43.*	15. *There is a readier and nearer way, The Brethren may censure them all, Way pag. 45. If the Congregation be found faithfull and willing to Remove an offence by due censure, why should the offence be called up to a more publicke Judicature.* Keyes pag. 42.

Anſ. This *C*ontradiction is made partly out of the concealment of Part of *my* words in the firſt *C*olumne, and Partly out of the *Addition* of ſome words of his *own* in the ſecond *C*olumne. In the former *C*olumne I ſay, If the *whole Presbytery offend, or ſuch a Part as will draw a Party, and a Faction in the Church with them, the readieſt courſe then is*, to bring the matter to a Synod where thoſe words, *ſuch a Part as will draw a Party, or Faction in the Church with them*, are given for the juſt Reaſon, why in ſuch a caſe, the caſe of the offending *Presbytery*, or other ſuch Leading members

in the Church ſhould be brought to a *Synod*, before it be cenſured in the Church. But in the words recited in the latter *Columne*, I ſpeak of the Congregation as Agreeing together, and both faithfull and willing to Proceed againſt *Hereticall* Doctrine and Scandalous crimes in whomſoever. And then they need not Trouble the *Synod* to cleare the caſe, which is already cleare unto themſelves, ſo that this Contradiction ſpeaketh not *ad Idem*. The one *Columne* ſpeaketh of a Church, Divided into *parts* and *Factions*, and their readieſt courſe is to bring the matter to a Synod. The ſecond *Columne* ſpeaketh of a Church both *faithfull* and willing to Proceede againſt offences with one accord. And then they have ſufficient Power within themſelves, to judge that which is right, and to execute their Judgment. That which is Added of the *Replyers own words*, in the latter *Columne*, doth help not a little to make up an Appearance of the Contradiction. In the *Keyes* I had ſayd (In the caſe above mentioned)

It

It is the *readieſt* courſe to bring the matter to the Synod. In the *Way* he quoteth my words, as if I had ſaid, *There is a readier and nearer way.* The Brethren may cenſure them all. If theſe words had been mine, there had been an *Appearance of Contradiction.*

To ſay this is the *readyeſt courſe*, and yet to ſay, a Diſcrepant courſe is a *readier and nearer way*, is (at leaſt, *verbo tenus*) an apparent Contradiction. But the Truth is, Thoſe words are *none of mine*, but the *Replyers own.* And ſo it will be an eaſy matter to make up Contradictions (*toti quot*) if we may take leave, in one ſentence to *conceale* Part of the words neceſſary to make up the ſenſe; and in another ſentence to *Adde* words of our owne.

The 16th Contradiction is delivered thus.

16. *It belongeth to the civill Magistrate, to establish pure Religion, in Doctrine, worship and Government: partly by civill Punishment upon the willfull oppressours, and Disturbers of the same.* Keyes p. 50.	16. *Yet the Brethren here call for, or Tolerate Toleration of all Opinions, and Deny the magistrate Power to Punish any Pretending conscience* Bartlets Model, pag. 128.	16. See Mr. Bartlets Modell p. 25. Contrà

Ans. 1. This *Contradiction* laboureth of the same Disease (as the rest generally Doe) It speaketh not *ad Idem.* Such as require the *Magistrate* to establish Pure Religion, in Doctrine, worship and Government, and to Restraine the willfull opposers and Disturbers thereof by civill Punishments, They speak of *Fundamentals in Religion*, and such opinions as apparently tend to *libertinisme*, and licentious ungodlynesse, as Mr *Bartlet* expresseth it, *Modell pag.* 126.

But the *Toleration* which they Allow and

and call for, is of such opinions, as neither subvert the *Foundation* of Religion, nor Practise of Piety. Both these may be maintained without the least shew of the face of Contradiction. Further I find this in Mr *Bartlet*, That himselfe and some others are not free, That Hereticks should be put to Death, in case they keep their errors to themselves, and doe not seek to seduce, and corrupt others. And though I grant, that such an Heretick after once or twice Admonition may be Rejected out of the Church (according to *Titus* 3.10,11.) yet I doe not finde, that *Moses* condemned them unto *Death*, unlesse they became *blasphemers*, or *Idolators*, or *Seducers to Idolatry*. What Christ, and *Moses* doe both of them Tolerate, the Servants of Christ need not to be ashamed of such Toleration.

Ans. 2. This Contradiction (for ought I can Discerne) laboureth also *Crimine falsi*. For it seemeth a manifest untruth, what he speaketh in *Columne* 2. That the Brethren call for, or Tolerate Toleration of all opinions, and

Deny the magistrate Power to punish any Pretending conscience, Mr *Bartlet* Alledged for the proofe hereof, *p.* 128. saith no such thing, And the contrary he proveth, from the expresse Testimony of Mr *Burroughs*, Mr *Thomas Goodwin*, & others of that way.

The 8th Chapt. Touching the 17th Contradiction with 18. 19.

The 17th Contradiction is thus set forth.

17. *Visible Saints though they be Hypocrites inwardly, are the matter of a visible church. Mr.* Hook. part. 1. p. 14. 15.	17. *You say Saints in outward Profession are the matter of a Congregationall Church:* we judge that reall Saints uttering in Discourse the Breathings of the *Holy Spirit*, and *experiences* of conversion, interested in a stricter conversation to be the matter. Dr. *Holmes* Epistle to *Way* cleared. *pag.* 4.	*Mr. Bartlet speaketh* something (this language) *Can there be Ability for spirituall & holy services, where the spirit* is not yet given? *Can there be communion between light and Darkness?* Can they edify *one another* in the Faith, *that have not the work of Faith wrought in them?* Modell. p. 57. See more pag. 103.

Ans. What Mr *Hooker's* Judgment was,

was, is expreſſed in that firſt *Columne*: what mine own, is declared, and I hope, cleared in the *Holyneſſe of Church-members*. What Dr *Holmes* and Mr *Bartlet* doe further require in it, they Declare what *Church-members* ought to be *de jure*, eſpecially in their firſt conſtitution, rather then what they are, or are wont to be *de facto*, eſpecially in their Declenſion. Againe I ſee Mr *Bartlet* ſpeaketh in oppoſition to the members of the *Pariſh Churches*, who are in many places Ignorant, looſe, profane and ſcandalous livers, who are not indeed *viſible Saints*, pag. 56.

It is true there is ſome work of the Spirit, where ever there is a viſible Saint. But the Spirit giveth many Gifts to the edification of others (as to *Judas* and *Demas*) which often doe not reach to the Regeneration of him that Receiveth them.

The 18th Contradiction is thus stated.

18. The forme of the visible uniting, viz. A visible Church is the living and communicating Covenant, either explicite or implicite; and the latter is sometimes fully sufficient. Mr. H. Surv. part. 1. pag. 47.48 and others.	18. You say an implicit uniting, viz. A walking and communicating with you is a sufficient evidencing of the Forme: we say, Their solemne confession of their faith & expresse owen covenanting with the Lord to walke with such a body of Saints, in all the wayes of Christ to be the manifest Forme. D. Holmes ibid.	18. It is no generall Profession will serve the turne, but there must be a peculiar engagement and appropriation to this or that particular body. Mr. H. Surv. pag. 63. Yet he said An Implicite Covenant was sufficient.

Anſ. The expreſſions of Mr *H.* quoted in *Columne* 1: and *Columne* 3: will not amount to an *oppoſition* of himſelfe, much leſſe to a *Contradiction*. For though he make an *Implicite Covenant* ſufficient, yet a *generall Profeſſion* will not ſerve the turne, to make an Implicite Covenant. For an *Implicite Covenant* muſt be with Reference to this or that particular Body: or elſe it is neither *Covenant* at all, nor Implicite. A Generall Profeſſion

Profession entreth not any man into any Relation with any Church, unlesse he offer himselfe to Joyne with them as Mr *Hooker* in that Place more largely, & truly openeth himselfe. Neither doth Dr *Holms* his expression contradict him. For he that maketh the *explicite Covenant* the manifest forme of the Church, He doth not gainesay the implicite covenant to be a *real* Forme of the Church, though not so *manifest* but more obscure.

The 19th Contradiction is thus delineated.

19. *We crave leave of the Auditors of the Keyes, To Declare that we Assent not to all expressions, or all and every Assertion in it: As in these Particulars. About the Professing of Private Brethren.*

2. *That the Assembly* (Act. 15.) *was a Formall Synod.*

3. *That the Apostles Acted in it, as Ordinary Elders.* Preface to Keyes. pag. 6.

19. *We doe in this Epistle certifie our Assent to the way of the Churches of New England, saving that we doe not fully close with some expressions passim in the Book: before some of which* (so at least, belike there are more) *we minded to Note a star in the Margin. Thus we could not but say and doe* (pace Authoris) *or we could not Assent.* Epistle to the Way pag. 2.

19. *Yet they are angry that we call for a fuller Declaration of themselves,* Epistle to the Way. p. 2. *and Epistle to the Way cleared* pag. 2.

Ans. 1.

Answer. 1. Though my *reverend Brethren* crave leave to dissent from me in some expressions (which they may safely and freely do without my leave, for I professe my spirit subject to the Prophets:) yet about the *Prophecying* of private Brethren, I must againe Professe as I did before, That I do not *know*, wherein I Dissent from them: unlesse it be that I Allow somewhat more liberty to the *Prophecying* of private Brethren, then they do. The Allowance, which they give is with foure limitations.

1. That it be done *occasionally*, and not in ordinary course.

2. By men of such Abilities, as are fit for office.

3. Not assuming this to themselves, but as they are allowed, and designed to it by such, as have *Power*.

4. That their Doctrine be subjected to the Teaching Elders of the Church. Graunt these limitations, and I never scrupled (to my remembrance) the liberty of Prophecying by private Brethren,

thren, yea this liberty I should further graunt, that though the private Brethren be not furnished, with abilities fit for publick office, yet there may be occasion, to call them forth to exercise their gifts; as in the suddaine sickneſſe or absence of the Minister, and other officers, why may not a private brother be called forth by the Church, or stirred up by the Spirit of God in himselfe to stand up, and with leave, instruct and exhort the Church, to make a Sanctified use of such a suddaine stroke of *Providence?* Or what if a private Brother of good credit in the church shall observe the Doctrine of the Ministers not so much valued as were meet? why may he not take occasion, to speak some words of encouragement, and confirmation, both to the *Minister* and to the *Congregation? Jehoſaphat's Nobles*, though Princes, yet were but as *Private Brethren* in the Church, as bearing no Publick Church-office: yet they taught in the Cities of *Juda*, what Reſpect was due to the Ministery of the *Levites*, whom

whom they brought with them, when my beloved Brethren do not acknowledge the Assembly of Apostles, Elders, and Brethren *Acts* 15. To have been a formall Synod of Messengers sent out of a set and combined Association from neighbour churches, They do not herein Dissent from me. For the two Churches of *Antioch* and *Jerusalem* were too farre remote to stand in a set, or combined Association, and therefore they may well deny it to be a *Formall Synod*, according to the Forme of Synods now in use in *Presbyteriall* Churches. But that that assembly had the true matter and forme of a just *Synod*, As I do believe it, so I do not see that my Brethren deny it. For the efficient cause of the *Synod*, the Church of *Antioch* sent messengers: and the Church of Jerusalem (whose officers were sent unto) they freely gave them a meeting, and the Church with them. For the *matter* of the *Synod*, they had the *Messengers*, officers, and Brethren of both Churches met together in the Name of

Christ.

Christ. It is not necessary to the being of a *Synod* the convention of the Messengers and members of many Churches, The convention of two Churches (by themselves or messengers) may make a Synod. If the convention of one Church may make a *Synagogue*, why may not the convention of two churches make a *Synod?* The forme of a *Synod* they had, in Arguing, and disputing the case in hand, and freely giving in their *Judgments* from scripture grounds, and at length determining the whole cause with the Joynt consent of the Apostles, Elders, and Brethren, and Publishing the same by letters, and messengers to all the churches whom it concerned. The establishment of Peace and Truth in the churches, was the *end* of this *Synod*, as it ought to be the end of all. It is true, here was a consultation, in that the church of *Antioch* sent for counsell: and the Apostles and Elders met to consult, and consider of the matter. But consultation was but one Act of the Assembly, many other *Formall* Acts of a

Synod they put forth besides, which have been specified. The Apostles though they did put forth some Acts of their Apostolicall Power, in helping to cleare the Truth by explayning obscure Scriptures, and in Ratifying the conclusion with some greater *Plerophory* of the mind of the Holy Ghost: yet in Putting such things to Argumentation, and Disputation, and allowing Elders and Brethren liberty of Putting in their votes, and determining, and publishing the sentence, in the Name and with the common consent of all, herein they Acted as *Ordinary Elders* and messengers of churches, might and ought to do.

The *Notes* of about Ten *Passages* in the *Way*, wherein our Reverend Brethren in *England* (or some of them) say they could not fully close with them, without Affixing an *Asterisk* to them. If I knew where the Pinch of the Difficulty lay, I would Addresse my selfe, to give them fuller satisfaction either by condescending to them, or giving them full Reason why I could not. Meane while

I have learned (through Grace) not to *fall out with my Brethren*, for greater differences in judgment, then those be.

That which is added in the third Columne, that they are offended (and, as you call it, *Angry with you*) for that you call for a fuller Declaration of themselves, for that, themselves can best give you an Account: for

1. It may be, they think it needlesse to Publish further declarations, because over & above the former Declarations, there have been since published three, or foure Pithy Pregnant Declarations of the same Argument; as Mr *Hookers* surv: Mr *Nortons* Answer to *Apollonius*, the *Synod* at Cambridge, the Defence of the *Answer* to the nine Questions.

2. It may be they feare, If they should publish more declarations in this case, It would Adde rather more Fewell to contention, then Prevaile with the Spirits of men, contrary minded to Receive satisfaction.

CHAP.

CHAP. 9.

Touching the 20th Contradiction and 21.

The 20th Contradiction is thus Expressed.

20. *It is generally asserted by them, that one Church hath not Power to Censure another.*

20 *A Synod hath Power to Determine, so withdraw Communion from them, if they cannot heale them, Keyes, pag. 24.*

20. *The sentence of non Communion denounced against whole Churches Apologa Narrat. p. 18, 19. If a sentence denounced is a Censure.*

Answer: To *withdraw Communion* from a church, is no more an Act of Power over a church, then it was to *Feyne* in Communion with them. Communion and non-Communion are Acts of the same power: both of them Acts of priviledge or liberty. And if withdrawing Communion be not an Act of censure, then to determine so to withdraw, is no Act of an higher Nature.

Though

Though a *Censure* is a *sentence denounced*, yet every *sentence denounced* is not a *Censure*, unlesse it be Denounced by an higher power, then that of equalls. When the Ten Tribes *denounced their Rejection* of service to *David's* House (1 Kings 12. 16.) It was not a censure more then theirs, who solemnely *Rejected the Rule of Christ: we will not have this man to Rule over us*, Luk. 19. 14.

The last Contradiction is declared thus.

21. *We Say Instituted worship and Ordinances do not flow immediatly from spirituall union, and Relation to Christ, and his members &c.* Def. of 9. Pos. pag. 76. *He must come at them in a right Order, to wit in Fellowship of the Church* Surv. pag. 2.	21. *Then it followeth, that Hearing the word Preached Singing of Psalmes and Baptisme, belong not to any, but such as are members of a Particular Congregation.* *And yet they say Ordinarily hearing is no signe of a Church member,* Surv. part. 1. pag. 18.	21. *A Person hath his first Right to the Sacrament (and so to other Ordinances, because He hath an Interest in the Covenant of the Gospell,* Surv. part. 1. pag. 65.

Answer: Here is no semblance of Contradiction; Mr *Hooker Survey* saith, a *Person* hath his first Right to a Sacrament, because he hath an interest in the covenant of the Gospell. The *defence* saith he hath not immediate Right till he be a member of a Particular Congregation. And so saith the *Survey* too, in the Place Alledged. If *Immediate* Right, and *first* Right were all one, there were some colour for the Exception: but it is farre otherwise; in having Christ, we have a first Right to all things, but not an Immediate Right but in Gods way.

But neither hence will it follow, that Instituted Ordinances; as hearing the word, Singing of Psalmes, belong to none but to members of a Particular Congregation. For though they be given to such *firstly*, and *Immediately*: yet for their sakes to all that come in amongst them. The Childrens Table and the Provisions thereof is *first Allowed* to the Children of the Family, yet in a Bountifull House-keepers Family, such part of

of the Provisions may be Allowed to strangers, as they may be fit to partake in.

FINIS.